

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. IX

Winter Number, 1940

No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	CHARLES K. GILBERT	JOHN W. LANGDALE
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
FREDERICK K. STAMM	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN	

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb	Carl Sumner Knopf	Harris Franklin Rall
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Umphrey Lee	Richard Roberts
Clarence Tucker Craig	Edwin Lewis	Wilbour E. Saunders
Albert Edward Day	McIlyar H. Lichliter	Luther A. Weigle
Wilbert F. Howard	Halford E. Luccock	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Thing of Price Is Man.....	Edgar P. Dickie 3
Then and Now.....	William Adams Brown 9
Chaos and Cosmos: A Meditation for Our Times.....	Edgar Sheffield Brightman 16
The Church's Contribution Toward a Warless World.....	John Foster Dulles 31
World Christianity: Assumptions and Actuality.....	Henry P. Van Dusen 41
The Intellectuals' Crisis in Religion.....	Harold Bosley 56
Protestantism and the Origins of Modern Science.....	A. S. Nash 66
Christian Citizenship in Action.....	Russell Henry Stafford 79
Amsterdam on the Church and Race Relations.....	Benjamin E. Mays 95
Trends in Group Work as Related to the Churches.....	Abel J. Gregg 105
The Bible in Contemporary Literature.....	Charles S. Braden 113
Who's Who as Friendship's Garland.....	John Sheridan Zelig 128
Man in Revolt (featured review).....	E. G. Homrighausen 138
Book Reviews.....	142
Bookish Brevities.....	159

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the January, 1940, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Published by
THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

64959

Borden P. Bowne Library Fund
 Bowed Feb. 1941

Who's Who?

- HAROLD BOSLEY, D.D.** Minister of Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
- CHARLES S. BRADEN, Ph.D.** Department of History and Literature of Religions, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
- EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN, Ph.D., LL.D.** Professor of Philosophy, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Ph.D.** Chairman of the Universal Christian Council.
- EDGAR P. DICKIE, M.C., B.A. (Oxon.), B.D. (Edinburgh).** Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, Saint Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland.
- JOHN FOSTER DULLES, International Lawyer.** Secretary at Hague Peace Conference, 1907; Counsel to American Commission at Paris Peace Conference, 1919. New York City.
- ABEL J. GREGG,** Secretary for Work with Boys, The National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States of America.
- E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN, D.D., Th.D.** Chair of Homiletics, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
- BENJAMIN E. MAYS, D.D.** Dean of the School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
- A. S. NASH, M.A., M.Sc.** General Secretary, Church of England Moral Welfare Council, London, England.
- RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD, D.D., LL.D.** Minister of the Old South Church in Boston.
- HENRY P. VAN DUSEN, Ph.D.** Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology and Dean of Students at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
- JOHN SHERIDAN ZELIE, D.D., Litt.D.** Wits End, Westwood, Mass.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933 OF RELIGION IN LIFE, published quarterly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1939.

State of New York) ss.
 County of New York)

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Arthur F. Stevens, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the business manager of the quarterly, RELIGION IN LIFE, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager are:

	Name of—	Post Office Address—
Publisher.....	The Abingdon Press, Inc.	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Editor.....	John W. Langdale and others	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Managing Editor.....	None	
Business Manager.....	Arthur F. Stevens	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
2. That the owner is:

The Abingdon Press, Inc.	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Owned by The Methodist Book Concern.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Publishing Agents:	
O. Grant Markham.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
George C. Douglass.....	420 Plum Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Fred D. Stone.....	740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, 1939. ARTHUR F. STEVENS, Business Manager
 [Seal] EDNA G. JEROME, Notary Public, New York County. (My commission expires March 20, 1940.)

Copyright, 1939, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

BR
1
FS22
v.9

22

A Thing of Price Is Man*

EDGAR P. DICKIE

"And God said, Let us make man."—Genesis 1. 26.

IT IS tragic to remember that we have to turn over only a few pages to read, "And it repented the Lord that he had made man." So soon! In a time like this, which seems to proclaim the bankruptcy of man's civilization, we can understand that thought of the divine impatience with His human creatures.

"Man," says Bacon, "is of kin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature."

"What is man?" the psalmist asks, and it is a perennial question, asked by every age, and answered by each in its own way.

It is a question most relevant to your present deliberations. The mind of man, which is the subject of some of your investigations, is the instrument of them all. Your discoveries, though pursued for their own sake, will nevertheless inevitably affect man's whole life—sometimes in ways beyond your control, and even alien to your desires—and conceivably they may determine, so far as man has it in his power to determine, the destiny of the world.

Thus man gathers here for worship, knowing that, with all his talents and discoveries, he is aware of a need which these cannot supply.

Attempts have been made to see man in true perspective by setting him against his cosmic background.

1. The Background of the Stars.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" No great spirit of any age has been able to look up to the starry heavens without a sense of wonder and humility descending on his soul; without being overwhelmed by the contrast of the divine greatness with human littleness, of the majesty of God with the insignificance of man.

* This sermon was to have been delivered to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, meeting at Dundee, Scotland. The sermon was never delivered, for at eleven o'clock on the morning of September third, 1939, the hour at which the service was to begin in the old Town Church of St. Mary's, Great Britain entered upon war with Germany.

In our own day that sense ought to be infinitely deeper, because of our increased knowledge of the vastness of the heavens. Tonight we may look into the sky and see a beam of light which set out on its long journey to the earth on that very night when the psalmist looked up into the heavens. Our human race is therefore only a speck upon a speck in this vast universe. To the pagan mind that thought can bring only despair. To the open mind it may suggest a more profound sense of awe and humility. But to the religious man it will convey a feeling of enlargement; of emancipation from the provincialism of this earth and its confined horizon. With all the wonders of nature from which to choose, God has selected man to be His special and peculiar care. He has spoken far more intimately in the souls of men than in all the majesty of the stars. It is by their vastness that the heavens seem to overwhelm our thought. But size is no indication of worth. You may balance on the fingertip a gem that will outprice Mount Everest. A mother's house is many times bigger than her child, but she cares most for him. God does not lavish His peculiar care on stars and suns, vast though they are, for stars and suns are only masses of unthinking matter. It may always remain an inscrutable problem how the unconscious and the material can be an expression of the Spirit of God; but when we rise to the level of mind and consciousness the problem becomes easier; and, when we enter the realm of faith and of man's divine sonship, we feel that the veil of mystery is becoming translucent. Martin Luther could even say that God has always longed for humanity as His own form of existence. The final proof of the value of human nature, even as it is seen against the background of the stars, is that it was great enough for the Son of God Himself to inhabit. Now, as at the first Christmas, the star leads us back to the cradle in Bethlehem.

2. The Background of Eternity.

Man is like to vanity: his days are as a shadow that passeth away. When life ended here, so the psalmist thought, it ended forever, never to be taken up again. But he had one inalienable consolation. This tiny fragment of time which was given to him was irradiated during its passage by the presence of God. The Hebrew poet can throw out simile after simile to show the transience of this life, and yet he persists in living on in sublime faith and blessedness, because it is a life that may be most truly measured in terms of its fellowship with the Eternal. His God is the Lord. In that confidence the Hebrew people could live nobly and die content long before there began to dawn the hope of immortality.

We are told how impossible it was for Thomas Carlyle to lose himself in any of the lighter forms of social intercourse. Through these dim cobwebs death and eternity sat glaring. (And we can easily picture Carlyle glowering back at them!) But the mere brevity of life was never the most pressing problem even for the people of the Old Testament, who did not think of any real continuance beyond. What mattered was its quality; the good done and the evil rejected, the character built up, the truth revealed, and the faith nurtured. So Fuller prayed to be delivered from sudden death, not because he feared the fact itself, but because he knew his need of being prepared against a day of judgment. "Lord, be pleased to shake my Clay Cottage before Thou throwest it down."

Here our assurance comes from God Himself. "I dwell in the high and holy place," He says; but to our astonished hearing He continues "with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." The sin of man brings its inevitable punishment, but the sinner is not abandoned. And to prove this to the most timorous doubter—to prove that Eternity is ours, belongs to us, and is meant for us; to prove that He who dwells in the high and holy place desires also to dwell with the humble and contrite—God stepped down from Eternity into Time; left the high and holy place for the humble earth. We are brought to see that the true nature of man becomes apparent only when he is set against another background.

3. The Background of Grace.

It is God in His grace who saves man from the extreme of humility, for God Himself, when He wished to show the depth of His love for man, chose the form of a man. The word "man" has taken on a quite new significance because of the life, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus. The word is transfigured because it has been used of Him, "the Man Christ Jesus." Without doubt it is against this background alone that we shall see man as he really is, but consideration of it is liable also to involve us in a difficulty and even in error. There are many today, calling themselves "humanists," who make a wrong use of the idea of immanence, or indwelling of God in man. If God, they say, is *completely* immanent in Jesus, is it not true to say that He is *partially* immanent in every man who lives on the earth, and that therefore the difference between any man and this perfect Man is one only of degree? That, however, is a mistake which the deeply religious person avoids by a sure instinct. Looking on the life and death of Jesus he knows

that here he is contemplating one who is not solely man; and, looking on men, sinful like himself, he is profoundly aware that they can never be made equal with Him. If man is to achieve that greatness for which the grace of God has intended him, he clearly needs more than the cultivation of those resources and gifts with which he is endowed. He must be, not merely educated or disciplined, but changed, redeemed, reborn. He sees that, if there is value at all in man, it comes from the grace of God, which is revealed in its fullness in Christ. In the words of the Marathi Christian poet, Tilak,

"If there is aught of worth in me,
It comes from Thee alone:
Then keep me safe, for so, O Lord,
Thou keepest but Thine own."

The immanence of the divine is not to be interpreted as indicating identity, for we are all aware of our own sin. If we speak of the absolute immanence of God in Christ, we point, indeed, to the culmination of a process which indicates to us that God has always longed for humanity as His own form of existence, but it is a culmination which involves the appearance of a new order, a unique personality. Men are not sons of God in the same way as Jesus, for there are wicked persons, and all are wicked in measure. Through grace we are called sons: He is not *a* son, but *the* Son.

Nevertheless it is not meaningless—on the contrary it is part of a true Christian anthropology—to see in man what can only be described as the image of God. We are not to think that men, having failed again and again, must be content with something less than that which God had in store for them. In his own humility and despair, a man may desire, like the prodigal, to be called only "Thy servant"; but God says, "My son." When we set man against the background of Calvary, we see him as he is in the eyes of God. We see his weaknesses, but, at the same time, we see his infinite value in the sight of God. This is not an alien background. The starry heavens are cold and indifferent. Eternity is beyond our comprehension. But the redemptive love of Christ speaks in a language which warms the heart and is understood by it. We have a new answer to the question, What is man? God so loved man that He gave His only Son for his sake. In the words of Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, "A thing of price is man, because for him Christ was crucified." (Τίμιον ξῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος · τίμιον γὰρ, εἰ δι' αὐτὸν ἐσταυρώθη Χριστός—Synesius, Epistle LVII.) We need not be afraid to rejoice in the goodness which we see in man. If we are true to the teaching

of the New Testament, the joy which we take in recognizing it will not be attributed to a weakened sense of sin, when it is nothing but a rightful acknowledgment of facts. (That was a mistaken piety in the narrow Puritan elder who, being shown a lovely flower, declared, "By the grace of God I have learned to call nothing lovely in this lost and sinful world!" and flicked off its head with his cane.) Yet the truth remains. Man is both the glory and the scandal of the universe. None of us can claim that the good which is in us is untainted with evil; none can point to a wholly disinterested action or lay claim to an impulse of pure, unalloyed love for God or man. We know that human sinfulness is universal, not because of any doctrinaire interpretation of the Fall, but from the actual experience of life and most of all from the humble and anguished self-condemnation of the most saintly Christian men and women. The Christian estimate of sin is a matter not of psychology but of theology; it arises not from our conception of man but from the revealed knowledge which we have of God. The value of man in the eyes of his Father is seen in the price which was paid for his ransom; but the darkness of the sin of man is also made plain by the fact that this price had to be paid. The relation between the *Imago Dei* and man's sinfulness was vividly presented by Rabbi Duncan in words which have become familiar. "A lady once said to me, 'The more I see of myself, I see nothing so properly mine as my sin.' I said to her, 'Well, you do not see deep enough. There is something far more properly yours than your sin; and your sin is improperly yours. It is a blot in your being, which, if you do not get quit of it, will never cease to be *unnatural* to you. No; the image of God is more properly yours, though you had no share in the production of it.'"

Man's inevitable failure in the task of obedience involves not merely a transient antagonism to the will of God, but also ultimate inability to obey, and even disappearance of the desire to obey. Communion between God and man is destroyed, and can be restored only from God's side. Anthropology passes into Christology; the doctrine of man into the doctrine of the Person of Jesus. In Christ the perfect image of God is restored to man, and man is revealed once more as no independent creature but as one who has his meaning only in God; as a sinner, but a sinner accepted by God's grace.

Our knowledge of this grace is very weak, and always wavering, but He who knew God best and loved Him as no other has ever done was surest of the life to come, and of the place which His children occupy in the heart

of the Father. A thing of price is man, because for him Christ was crucified. Therefore this world cannot contain him, and death cannot hold him who belongs to God. Our hope is founded on good news. The ground of it is the character of God revealed in Jesus. Nothing can shake that. Like a great physician, whose presence is sweet with certainties, God gave an assurance that cannot be questioned. He raised Jesus from the grave. He showed that there is one thing over which death has no power. *Love* cannot be destroyed. You may crucify and kill the body, but you cannot kill love. Christ is risen. The difference which He has made is clear. Without Him we have only the pagan dirge,

"Fear no more the heat o' the sun,
Nor the furious winter's rages;
Thou thy worldly task hast done,
Home art gone and ta'en thy wages.
Golden lads and girls all must,
As chimney-sweepers, come to dust."

That is the pagan burial service. There are three words in it at which we may catch—"Home art gone." But to us they mean something very different. Home, to the Father's house. Had that not been true, Christ would have let us know. "If it were not so I would have told you; I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also."

Then and Now

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

ON THE twenty-ninth day of July, 1914, I was in Paris on my way to a Peace Conference to be held at Constance in Germany. On that day the German Ambassador handed in his passport and we knew that war was certain. This made it impossible for me to continue my journey. None the less, the Conference was held and proved the first of many such to follow.

Almost exactly twenty-five years later, in July, 1939, I was at Clarens in Switzerland attending a meeting in the interest of Christian Unity. On July twenty-third news was received of the Russo-German Pact and it soon became apparent that within a few days we were again to witness the outbreak of a world war.

In 1914 war came upon us suddenly. No one had believed it possible. Even after war had begun, no one believed that it could last more than a few months. Yet the unbelievable happened. For more than four years the war continued and in spite of all that our government could do, we, of the United States, found ourselves among the belligerents.

This time there has been no surprise. For years we have seen the clouds gathering. For months we have been living in an atmosphere of recurrent crisis. In every country the eyes of statesmen have been directed to this one issue and the resources of the nations have been strained to the utmost to pile up armaments against the day when Armageddon would break loose.

During these anxious weeks and months we have witnessed a peace campaign on an unprecedented scale. It is not only the peace societies that have been active, or the churches which have been lifting up their voices against the sin of war. In every country the peoples have been pleading with their statesmen to find some way to deliver them from this evil worse than death.

And yet war has come. It would not be strange if, under such circumstances, lovers of peace should feel discouraged, and Christians wonder if the prayers which they have been offering to the God of Peace have gone unheard.

I do not believe that this feeling is justified. I believe that the years

since the Armistice have been years of progressive moral education which in due time, if we do our part, are bound to issue in constructive action; and I wish in the few pages allowed me, to point out some reasons for this conviction.

First of all, I should put the general recognition: that war in its modern mechanized form is the world's supreme evil, drawing into its remorseless sweep everything that man holds precious for victor and vanquished alike.

This is something "new under the sun." Until yesterday (measured by the calendar of history), war was not only thought inevitable. It was regarded as man's most honorable occupation. It was glorified by the State and blessed by the Church. The great places in the world's catalogue of honor were reserved for the men who had waged war successfully. Today war is looked upon everywhere with loathing and horror. The praises of the dictators and the concerted propaganda of their agents have not been able to prevent the shudder of horror which has swept over the peoples and not least the people of Germany, when they realized that once more they might have to pass through this baptism of fire.

It is no longer necessary to call upon the churches to pronounce war evil. The conscience of mankind is doing this today with an unmistakable voice.

This is not simply because of the physical suffering war brings and the economic waste it causes, but because of the moral and spiritual estrangement which is its inevitable consequence. War, in its modern form, not only diverts the energies of men from the constructive tasks upon which the welfare of mankind depends; it introduces into the life of nations abnormal relationships which make the transition to healthful ways of living extraordinarily difficult. The fact that we see this so clearly is our first ground for hope.

And as we ask how this change has come about we must not forget those heroic spirits who, twenty-five years ago, gave their lives in what they believed was a war to end war. When we contrast the world's feeling toward war today with what it was then, who shall say that their sacrifice was in vain? "This pause before battle to ask questions about what will be after," writes Anne O'Hare McCormick, "is a kind of answer to the voices we no longer hear: the voices silenced by the last war."¹

A second thing that we have been learning in these post-war days, is that war is not an isolated thing that can be attacked directly. It is, itself, the consequence of older and more deep-seated evils. It has its roots in habits of jealousy, self-interest and pride, individual and social, which war has re-

¹ *New York Times*, October 28, 1938.

vealed and accentuated. In these deeper causes of estrangement we all alike share. No individual and no nation can point to another and say "You alone are guilty." For all of us the primary duty is repentance, individual and national. And with repentance, the willingness to accept whatever burden may be laid upon us as our part of the common guilt of mankind.

This confession of guilt does not mean we should be blind to the moral issues involved in the present struggle. Where these issues seem to us clear, we should give generous sympathy and wholehearted support. It does mean that we must consider these issues in the light of their deeper causes and realize that the peace for which we pray can come only when these have been removed.

Thoughtful students of our time like Norman Angell and Sir Arthur Salter have been telling us this with patient iteration, but their words have failed to register. The nations have been content to pass resolutions renouncing war and praising peace, while they have continued, though still at peace, practices which unless abandoned must sooner or later make war inevitable.

We are discovering the futility of this procedure. A few weeks ago the Fellowship of Reconciliation published a remarkable document. It was a program for pacifists, based upon the thesis that negation alone will avail us nothing. We must have a positive substitute for the evil we ask men to renounce. Even though we do not yet see what this substitute is and how it is to be applied, it is much that we recognize this as the point of next attack.

But we have gone further than this. We know what the evil is that we must renounce if we are to banish war. It is unrestricted national sovereignty—the doctrine that there is no law but national self-interest which should determine national policy. We are coming to see that such an attitude is not only morally wrong, it is politically suicidal. For nations as well as for individuals the law holds that none of us lives to himself and none dies to himself.

A few days ago the Archbishop of York, in an address delivered before the League of Nations Association urging an early definition of war aims, expressed the judgment that such a definition should include provision for some form of federation, and that Britain should be willing to accept whatever limitation of sovereignty the establishment of such a federal system would involve. Our own Federal Council, in an open letter to the President of the United States approving his expressed intention to keep this country out of war, has made it clear that in taking this position it does not advocate

national isolation. On the contrary, it urges the President at some appropriate time to indicate the terms on which this country will be willing to co-operate with others in the establishment of a just and stable peace. And the Council goes on record as saying that for the sake of such a peace we should be willing to accept some limitation of national sovereignty.

But it is one thing to affirm this and quite another to see how the transition to the new state of things is to be made. Here we find Christians of equal sincerity divided. Some believe that the transition can be made by purely peaceful methods. They are convinced that the evils which war brings with it are so great that the Christian should have no part in it, however just the cause for which it may be waged. They point to our experience in the last war in justification of their position. We fought, they tell us, to end war; to make the world safe for democracy; to lay the foundation of a just and enduring peace. And what we achieved was the peace of Versailles, the peace which made Hitler possible.

Others are convinced that those who are willing to accept a limitation of their own national sovereignty must be prepared, if need be, to combine in restraining those who will not. They are persuaded that in the international field, not less than within our nation, there are situations in which the use of armed force to maintain order may prove the lesser of two evils.

The sin for which they feel guilty and of which they would make confession is not that they gave their support when in 1917 the government of the United States declared war for what seemed to them a just cause; but that when peace came they failed to persuade their fellow citizens to accept America's share of her responsibility for laying the foundation of a just and stable peace. The sacrifice they feel we ought to be ready to make is willingness to support a stable international order even at the cost of war.

Until recently the Church has been content to leave it to the individual conscience to decide as between these alternatives. It has justified the right of the conscientious objector and it has equally justified the right of him who feels that he must fight for conscience' sake; but it has had no guidance to give as to the conditions that should determine the decision. But it is just at this point that the individual Christian most needs help from his church. Here the Pope has set an example which we Protestants will be wise to emulate. In his recent Encyclical, without entering the debatable land of party politics, he has laid down certain general principles covering the relation of States for which he invokes the support of the Christian conscience; and the respect

with which his utterance has been received in circles far beyond the Roman Church, is the best proof that it meets some deep need of human nature.

In this field too, we of the non-Roman Churches have progress to report. Anticipating the need of which we have spoken, the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches brought together at Geneva, in July of this year, a group of representative Christians from eleven countries of Europe, East Asia and North America, including nations at war or threatened with war, "to consider what action is open to churches and individual Christians, with a view to checking the drift toward war or to leading us nearer to the establishment of an effective international peace."

Among the laymen taking part in this Conference were men who have been officially connected with the Paris Peace Conference, the Hague Peace Conferences, the Hague Court, the Reparations Commission, the Mandates Commission, the Lima Conference, foreign trade and tariff boards, government economics commissions, and the International Red Cross. Some were experts in international law. Among the clerical participants were leaders of the ecumenical movement and of various national churches.

After five days of debate, during which at more than one point there was acute tension, the group agreed unanimously on a "definite statement of guiding principles for the solution of an effective international order." They are such as these:

1. That political power must always be exercised with a full sense of responsibility;
2. that all human beings are of equal worth in the eyes of God and should be so treated in the political sphere;
3. that it becomes, therefore, the duty of the ruling power to develop equality before the law into a political system which carries with it political rights and duties; and since
4. no true government can exist without law, and no law can exist without a sense of obligation to the members of the community, it follows
5. that there must be some form of international organization which will provide the machinery of confidence and co-operation.
6. The full discharge of this responsibility will require that the collective will of the community be used to secure the necessary changes in the interests of justice, to the same extent that it is used to secure the protection of the nation against violence.

It is no small gain to have discovered that even under the present difficult conditions so large a measure of agreement can be reached. However much we may differ as to how these principles should be applied in detail, at

least they give us a standard by which to test the political proposals which are offered for our acceptance.

But this is only the first step. In the complicated relationships of modern life—racial, economic, political—there is no short or easy road to justice. No change of boundary lines can completely solve the minority question. No alteration of traffic schedules can remove the natural disadvantage from which millions of our fellow Christians suffer; but this is certain, that without some change in the spirit of men, even the measure of success which is humanly possible will be unattained. Peace is not a negative thing. It is a high and holy enterprise. It requires great sacrifice and the willingness to take risks for the sake of conscience. Unless we are willing to take these risks and to make this sacrifice, our words will carry little weight.

Here the Christian Church faces its primary responsibility. It is not enough in these anxious and bitter days to tell others what they ought to do. We must set an example by showing the right spirit ourselves.

We come here to our greatest reason for encouragement. The years that have intervened since the last war have been years of trial and persecution for many of our fellow Christians; but they have shown that the spirit of the martyrs is still alive in the Church. In every country we have seen men and women who have been willing to suffer persecution rather than do violence to their conscience. In Manchukuo, Christian pastors have gone to jail for no other crime than that of being Christians. In Korea, converts have refused to worship at the shrine of the Emperor because this seemed to them a denial of their Christian faith. In China, congregations driven from their homes by the relentless pressure of the Japanese war machine, have gone out into the wilderness carrying their faith with them and have become missionaries in parts of China where heretofore Christianity had not penetrated. In Germany, more than two thousand pastors have refused to surrender their convictions at the behest of the government, and many of them (how many, we do not definitely know) have gone to concentration camps. The heroism of the pastors has been reflected in the spirit of the people. From many a congregation there has come heartening evidence that the experiences through which the German Church has been passing, far from weakening the faith of its members, have resulted in a widespread revival of personal religion.

From a recent message delivered to his congregation by Bishop Meiser of Germany, during the early days of the war, I take these words: "What shall we preach? Our duty cannot consist in taking sides on the political

events of the day or in repeating army reports. Certainly our preaching will be permeated with this great and grave experience of our time. We cannot preach as though nothing had happened. But we cannot confine ourselves simply to the event in time, for our preaching must always reach the heights of the eternal. Nor must we forget the note of repentance. For God is merciful only to the merciful. Only penitence leads to forgiveness and only forgiveness brings the strength to lead a new life."

That is a word which comes to us from Germany. As long as the Church possesses leaders who, under the strain of war, can show such a spirit, we have ground for hope.

Most encouraging is the fact that in spite of all temptation to the contrary, the Japanese and Chinese Christians have maintained their fellowship unbroken through these two years of war. We had an impressive illustration of this at the Madras and again at the Amsterdam Conference, both attended by large delegations from both countries. This fellowship reached its climax in the great Communion Service in the Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam where the delegates of both countries sat side by side at the Lord's Table.

In this spirit, far more widespread than the censorship of the dictators allows us to realize, is our hope. Across the barriers of nationality and race there is a Christian fellowship which is as wide as the world. We must see to it that this be kept alive.

And we have a far better chance of doing so than we had twenty-five years ago. Then the Ecumenical Movement was at most a hope. Now it is a reality. Each year it has grown stronger, and the plan for the World Council of the Churches is only the latest and most dramatic example of a comradeship which is our surest basis for faith for the years that lie beyond the war.

We, of the American churches, must be true to this comradeship. Thus far we have been spared the bitter tests which have come to many of our fellow Christians. All the more is it our duty to support, in every possible way, the representatives of the Provisional Committee who, from the neutral countries as base, are trying—often under great difficulty—to keep the channels of communication open. We must resist every temptation to bitterness. We must make it our business to share every evidence that comes to us of generosity and unselfishness on the part of those at war. We must strengthen the hands of those who—while war is still going on—are working for a peace of conciliation and forgiveness. Above all, we must show by our conduct as American Christians that the kind of unity which we hold up as our ideal for the State is in the way of being realized in the Church.

Chaos and Cosmos

A Meditation for Our Times

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

“WHY are so many great men not religious?” asked a student of his teacher during the summer of 1939. The teacher might have replied, “My child, those who are not religious are not truly great.” The student would rightly have resented such an answer as evasive and unfair. An honest teacher must admit the presupposition of the question. Consider the men counted great in scholarship, in literature, in art, in statesmanship: many of them, as Professor James Henry Leuba has sufficiently proved, are unbelievers. Adolf Hitler and his recent comrade Joseph Stalin are undeniably great men and undeniably irreligious. Moreover, it is a specific teaching of Christianity that “not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called” (1 Corinthians 1. 26). No book of the New Testament contains the word “great” so often as the Revelation of Saint John the Divine, and no book is more merciless in its hostility to the great. The Revelator pictures the great as being just as submissive to the unfair social and economic demands of an evil government as are the small and poor:

And it was given unto him to give breath to it, even to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as should not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free and the bond, that there be given them a mark on their right hand, or upon their forehead; and that no man should be able to buy or to sell, save he that hath the mark, even the name of the beast or the number of his name (Revelation 13. 15-17).

The mark of the beast is accepted by the small and by the great; we must add, sadly but honestly, by people and sometimes even by priest.

The student's question remains. Why are not the great more concerned about social wrongs? Why are they either swept along by propaganda for economic or military warfare, or else themselves are the originators and instigators of it? Why are so many great men not religious? Must we say that a great man is so proud, so self-inflated, that he cannot be religious?

This supposition is refuted by the many men of transcendent greatness who have been humbly and faithfully religious.

Greatness, whatever else it may be, always requires a clear and intense vision of some end and a concentration of purpose on that end. It often happens that the great man's "end"—his *telos* as Aristotle calls it—is a result of some gift or of specialization in some one field. When that is true, it may happen that the more clearly the great man sees his *telos*, the more blind he is to everything else; the more fully he masters his specialty, the more ignorant he is of what lies beyond. It is one thing to see and know the Alps; it is another to know that beyond the Alps lies Italy. Religion calls on everyone to face what lies beyond his special interest, and to subordinate that interest to the interest of the whole. If a great man cannot relate his specialty to his whole soul and all its needs; or if his personality cannot co-operate with human society; or if he cannot concentrate on his special purpose while at the same time subordinating it to the larger purposes of God; then he may still be great in a human sense, but he cannot be religious.

It is in large part to the combination of clear vision with extreme concentration of purpose that we must ascribe the failure of so many great men to be religious. Because of their clarity of vision, and the stern demands of their purpose, they see with unusual sharpness the defects of human nature and the obstacles in physical nature.

"The time is out of joint; O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right."

No matter what the aims of a great man may be, he knows and must know the magnitude of the problem which faces him. He must be acutely conscious of the disjointedness of things and people; and if he does not see beyond his own *telos*, he sees no meaning in the whole. He sees himself as the God who must banish chaos with no help other than his own genius. If he fails, all is lost.

Over against all this, religion is always a view of the meaning and value of the whole. No enjoyment or suffering of any special part of truth or reality is religious unless that part is not only related but subordinated to the divine purpose of the whole. The great man is often either too narrowly specialized or else too humble intellectually to venture any faith about the whole of existence. Religion is either too simple or too lofty for many of the great. Yet a man who sees harmony and purpose in the whole in spite

of his clear vision of incompleteness and chaos in the immediate present is a man whom religion makes greater than he would otherwise have been.

But the truth and value of religion cannot and must not blind us to the actual facts; and the facts are not all of one kind. Daily experience, daily broadcasts and newspapers, daily observations of unemployment and need, daily psychological and physiological tragedies familiar to every pastor and physician are evidence of a world in which harmony and love do not control all things. War but magnifies these tragedies. The rugged old conservative, Aristophanes, describing his times (he died 380 B. C.), wrote that "Whirl is King, having driven out Zeus." In May of the ominous year 1929, Walter Lippmann in his *Preface to Morals* chose the old words of Aristophanes as the motto of his book, forgetting that, if Whirl had survived the intervening centuries, Zeus had also survived. There is the mad Whirl and there is the divine Zeus. But which is King? Tell us, great man. Tell us:—Whirl or Zeus?

I

The struggle between Whirl and Zeus typifies the eternal tension and conflict between the principle of Chaos and the principle of Cosmos in the universe. Man has always known of this struggle. The very words we use to name it—Chaos and Cosmos—come from the ancient Greek. These words are worth pondering.

Cosmos is a rich Greek word. It means order, and beauty or adornment (our beauty shops deal in cosmetics and preserve the ancient word as well as modern complexions); and it also means universe, the total unity of things (which is studied in cosmology). For the Greek, the universe as a system of law and purpose, was order and beauty. To see the world as God sees it is to see a Cosmos. John Skinner, in his famous commentary on Genesis, thinks that the sublime words, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," mean that God's handiwork was an "organized universe," a planned and purposeful Cosmos, in contrast to all that is without form and void.

But the Greeks and the Hebrews were too honest and realistic to suppose that all is order and beauty in the universe. "At the first," says Hesiod, "there was 'Chaos.'" With Chaos, there was Erebus and dark night—but there was also Eros—love. And because there was Eros, the Chaos could be mastered and Cosmos emerge. So, too, the writer of the Priestly Code

in Genesis declared that the earth was originally "without form and void," waste and empty Chaos. "Darkness was upon the face of the deep." The Hebrew writer thought of the original Chaos as formless confusion, and darkness, and the deep—the watery abyss. Of all visible things, water is the most formless, the most permeating, the most perilous to man. Water was the original chaos in the Hindu Law Books of Manu and in the epic of the Mahabharata. The watery abyss—T'hom in Hebrew, Tiāmat in Babylonian—figured in Babylonian mythology as the monster against which Marduk, the Sun God, contended. Marduk conquered, cut the monster in two, and out of its upper half made the heaven, out of its lower half, the earth; he divided the firmament. The conquest of Tiāmat by the Sun God is perhaps reflected in the Biblical words, "Let there be light." In most of the ancient myths of mankind there occurs some form of this conflict between the principle of Chaos and the principle of Cosmos, which ends in the control of the given by the ideal.

As we ponder these ancient myths, it would be well for us to remember how the ancients viewed their myths. Hesiod, rugged Boeotian peasant, prophet, and poet, of the ninth century before Christ, ascribes to the Olympian Muses these words about the myths in his *Theogony* (if indeed Hesiod wrote it):

"We know how to speak many false things as though they were true;

But we know, when we will, to utter true things."

Here is Vaihinger's philosophy of the *als ob* in 850 B. C.; but here is also deeper insight into truth than any *as though* or *as if*. Here is the faith that man can actually grapple with the real.

II

If we look at the Hebrew cosmology a little more closely, we see how the Priestly Writer conceived God's problem. *Given*: the earth without form and empty; darkness upon the face of the watery abyss. *To create* an ordered universe. *Method*: "The Spirit of God moved (or brooded) upon the face of the waters." God's love of Cosmos—of order and beauty and wholeness—acted on the existing Chaos. In response to the voice of God's Spirit, "Let there be light," "there was light," and an ordered universe came gradually into being. He set bounds to the waters of Chaos; he brought law and life and personality out of the confusion and night. The magnificent drama of creation was the action of a God able to cope with the problem of

Chaos. If, as the Greek Thales thought, all is water,—all is made of a formless and chaotic stuff that holds every shape and no shape,—yet as Thales also thought, “all things are full of gods.” If everywhere there is the principle of Chaos, everywhere the divine ordering of Cosmos is also present—brooding, moving, creating.

III

We have called this “A Meditation for our Times,” yet we have been speaking of ancient myths of Babylonia and Greece and Israel. Is there any truth for our times in these allegories of long ago—truth which has sometimes been missed by believers and unbelievers alike? For answer, let us consult experience.

Our observations of the physical world lead us to view it as an evolutionary process in which higher types of order, ever more complex, more meaningful, and more favorable to spiritual life, are gradually and painfully being developed. The myth of the struggle of Marduk, the god of light, with Tīāmat, the monster of Chaos, applies most aptly to the evolutionary struggle for survival in which fitness, and purpose, and law triumph slowly over unfit organisms and hostile environments. Evolution seems to be a conflict between light and darkness, or between purposeful and purposeless forces. God’s method seems to be that of the gradual conquest of Chaos by Cosmos. The myth seems to fit the physical order. There is brute fact and chance; there is order and purpose. And the beauty and order of heavens and earth are made out of the slain body of the dragon.

If the myth applies to the physical world; how much more does it apply to the realm of spirit! The individual’s spiritual life begins as Chaos. William James’s famous formula sums up the mind of the baby as “a blooming, buzzing confusion.” It is without form and void; and darkness is upon the face of the deep. Yet the little mind is not quite formless, not quite empty, not wholly dark, for the spirit of God moves upon the chaotic soul of the baby, and there come light and longing and love. As the child grows, there arise order and beauty and some glimpse of a universe. But Cosmos must again and again fight the battle with Chaos. During adolescence, Chaos comes again. The moral chaos of sin creeps into the garden of Cosmos; and man’s life is labor and sweat, and woman’s lot is pain. But the myth is not complete nor is the story of God’s dealing with the soul finished, until, after many hard experiences with man, God says to Noah, “I do set my bow in

the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth . . . between me and you and every living creature of all flesh." The psychological truth here is also the spiritual message of all religion. Let pain and toil and sin be seemingly unendurable. Let them blind humanity and let them cause God Himself figuratively to despair and to repent of having made man. Let the picture be as dark as you please for the soul, as dark as it is in 1940. Nevertheless, there is the bow of promise. Death may be found on every hill and valley, but life lies ahead. There is the Spirit of God saying, "Let there be light." Cosmos is the victor over Chaos. Nothing can utterly crush the aspiration of the soul, because always in the Chaos, God is there, brooding on the face of the deep waters of the soul. From infancy to maturity to eternity, there is no Chaos of which Cosmos is not the potential master.

If such is the story of the individual soul, how much more is the myth needed to illuminate history! It is easier to see Cosmos in the noble individual than in the course of history or in any society that has ever been on this earth. Many good men have held that meaning can be found only in the individual soul, never in social groups or historical processes. Reinhold Niebuhr (rather too optimistically) lauds "moral man" and (rather too pessimistically) deplors "immoral society." If men were as moral as Niebuhr thinks, society could not be quite so immoral; or if society were as immoral as he thinks, men could not be quite so moral. Yet it remains true that there are Christlike individual souls; whereas there are very few Christlike groups, whether states, or corporations, or labor unions, or political parties, or churches. If Chaos corresponds to Plato's principle of violence and Cosmos to his principle of persuasion, then violent Chaos is nearer the surface of every society than it is in the soul of the good man. Even good men despair of the power of persuasion and Cosmos in social relations, while taking it for granted in personal relations.

When the prophet Jeremiah composed a meditation for his own time, it was a picture of Chaos come again.

I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was waste and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved to and fro. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful field was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of Jehovah, and before his fierce anger (Jeremiah 4. 23-26).

The social order, in the eyes of Jeremiah, was so wicked that nature itself was involved in the universal chaos. It is significant for us that this was a wartime utterance of the prophet:

How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet? For my people are foolish, they know me not; they are sottish children, and they have no understanding; they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge (Jeremiah 4. 21-22).

Like the summer student mentioned at the outset, Jeremiah said, "I will get me unto the great men . . . for they know the way of Jehovah, and the justice of their God" (Jeremiah 5. 5). And like the student, he observed, "But these with one accord have broken the yoke and burst the bonds." That is, they have cast off the restraints of Cosmos, of beauty and order and divine law, and chosen the way of Chaos. Jeremiah's verdict is that a society which continues in this way, which chooses the path of war and violence as the only way to achieve its ends, has entered on a road which leads to inevitable ruin. "Refuse silver shall men call them, because Jehovah hath rejected them" (Jeremiah 6. 30). This was not Jeremiah's last word. A society that persists in the way of chaos cannot escape the end of chaos. But the greatness of Jeremiah is that his faith did not depend on the success of his nation. God was not race or blood or soil to Jeremiah. God was not even victor in war. If Jehovah rejects Israel or Germany or America, if Cosmos rejects Chaos, yet the Cosmos of Jehovah abides, and His purpose will find new ways of fulfillment.

Behold, the days come; saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant . . . They shall all know me . . . I will forgive their iniquity (Jeremiah 31. 31-34).

Is not Jeremiah's experience repeatedly verified in history? The magnificent Greek civilization disintegrated partly as a result of Alexander's wars. The Roman Empire declined and fell. There are Dark Ages and Revolutions and World Wars. Chaos comes again repeatedly. But Jeremiah would not interpret this as the victory of Chaos. He would see it as the God of Cosmos rejecting the Chaos of man, and yet keeping at his task of Cosmos. The high point of Jeremiah's philosophy of the Chaos-Cosmos of history appears in his words, "And when the vessel that he made of the clay was marred in the hands of the potter, he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it." When the spiritual life of the Middle Ages was stagnant, He made it again with the life blood of classic thought

and scientific experiment. When the Church was hopelessly corrupt, He made it again with the Reformation of Martin Luther. When the World War had all but paralyzed the human spirit, He made it again with President Wilson's aspiration for a League of Nations. What if the League of Nations was also broken on the potter's wheel? Are we not followers of the Christ who came, when the world was spiritually broken, as God's symbol that He will always make it again?

The principle of Chaos, present at the beginning, persists through every stage of history. But Chaos is not the will of God; for the will of God has always lifted man's spirit after its worst defeats and kept it on its way. "And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be not troubled: these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet" (Mark 13. 7). It is foolish beyond words to regard war as the way of salvation; one more war, one more drink, one more turn of the wheel of fortune, and then paradise. This is a dream. But, in the light of history, it is even more dreamy to regard war as the final defeat of faith and the refutation of God. War does not refute God: it refutes only man's sin and folly. War is not the end, the goal, the *telos*. When we see war, we know the end is not yet; the cosmos cannot be overthrown by chaos. Divine purpose may be delayed, but it will not be destroyed. In a universe of light, there is darkness when the earth turns away from the sun. Just as surely as the earth must turn on its axis, so surely the light prevails.

IV

If we apply the myth of chaos and cosmos more closely to the world situation today, we find much reason to share the mood of Jeremiah about his time. The earth seems again to be without form and void. We are ready to understand another doctrine of the ancient Greeks, which Plato expounds in the *Philebus* and elsewhere. The Greeks, quite differently from most moderns, thought of infinity as evil and of the finite as good. If we define the infinite—to *apeiron*—as being that which has no limit, and the finite as being that which has limits, then the infinite corresponds to chaos, a state of affairs in which law and order and beauty are utterly lacking, and only confusion obtains. When we say "that's the limit," we mean that there is action without any inhibition or control or ideal; in short we mean, "there is no limit," and hence no good. Here we pay tribute to the rightness of Greek insight.

We seem now to be living in an era when all limits but the love of power have been removed from much international policy and much economic striving. Infinite, unlimited Chaos is what we perceive about us. Herbert Spencer's well-known description of the original Chaos as "indefinite, incoherent homogeneity," applies admirably to our own times, except that it would be very difficult to discover the homogeneity of the situation, unless it be a homogeneity of evil. Darkness is on the face of the deep, but the homogeneity of darkness is deceptive. There is more in the dark than the eye can see.

Not only is Whirl king today even more than in the days of Aristophanes or in Lippmann's 1929, but there is a more conscious and explicit attack on Cosmos by Chaos than history has seen for many ages. Anti-religious world views have existed previously. Rarely if ever before have they attained a combination of political power with open contempt for scientific and philosophical objectivity as well as for social justice. And rarely has the cause of Cosmos—of reason and religion—been so widely defended for political and economic reasons by persons to whom the real spirit of reason and religion is utterly foreign. May Cosmos preserve God from some of His friends.

It is not necessary to paint the picture of contemporary Chaos in detail. We can see it for ourselves.

V

What we need is not more contemplation of Chaos. The end is not yet. We need to read the signs of the times for what lies beyond. If we are to read those signs, we require the realism of the watchman in the oracle recorded in the twenty-first chapter of Isaiah.

Watchman, what of the night?
Watchman, what of the night?
The watchman said,
The morning cometh, and also the night.

The prophet saw that after every night there follows a morning; but he also saw that the conflict of light against darkness, of Cosmos against Chaos, will go on.

From the ancient myth and the agonies of our own day there are profound truths to be learned. They can be learned only by those who can

discern the invisible spirit of God, as well as the palpable darkness, on the face of the waters. Let us dwell on three such truths.

The first truth is that the work of Cosmos is not finished. It is clear that the myth says, "And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." Yet it is impossible to take the word "finished" literally. Experience shows that everything is involved in a process of constant change and activity. Nothing is finished. Nothing can stand still, either in the physical order or in the spiritual order. The more we learn of physics and psychology, the harder it is to find anything more permanent than the law of change. If anything abides, it is only personality, human and divine, which lives and moves and changes while it endures and remembers and knows its own unity. Should the Priestly Writer have been adumbrating any truth when he said that the heavens and the earth were finished, it is only the truth that the Spirit of God is permanently victor in the control of the formless darkness of Chaos. But this in no way means that God's creative work is now actually complete or that his task will ever be finished. We may take quite literally the rendering which tells us that "the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters." God moved at the beginning, and He always moves. The living God is no Aristotelian Unmoved Mover. He acts, and He acts in co-operation with every soul that moves toward Him. The task of controlling the Chaos of existence by the ideals of Cosmos, and of conquering the rebellious wills and ignorant minds of men by righteousness and truth is an infinite task. Kant spoke of the *unendliche Aufgabe*, the infinite task, of knowing the world of nature. But the task of building a world of spirit in the world of nature is even more truly infinite.

If this first truth be really a truth, we have not to expect a time when all victories shall have been finally won, all tasks performed, all Chaos exterminated. Some are distressed and appalled by the prospect of an eternal task. They seek, more like Buddhists than Christians, for eternal quiet and rest. But instead of being appalled by an eternal spiritual destiny for man—in this world and in the world to come—we should see in this prospect the promise and the meaning of immortality. No matter what victories are won, there are more to win; no matter what knowledge is achieved, there is more to know. Perhaps it may forever be said, "The end—the *telos*—is not yet." Perhaps the task of divine cosmos is inexhaustible, and the perfection of the universe may consist not in its being finished at some future time, but rather in its indefinite, eternal perfectibility.

There would be serious reason to doubt this faith only if there were grounds for supposing that a time would come when the potentialities of God could at last be totally exhausted. Is today that time? There have been dark ages in the past, and never yet has divine potentiality been baffled. Furthermore, even in the darkest nights, signs of a future coming morning have been visible here and there. To look at the world of the present and say that there are no signs of longing for peace and justice and God is to be a willful pessimist. If the proof of the unfinished state of God's plans never was so good as it now is, the proof of God's Spirit working in mysterious ways in the minds of men in every country in the world has rarely been better. Though the good are temporarily helpless, let us never forget that their goodness, and not their temporary helplessness, is the true revelation of the purpose of our unfinished universe.

A second truth which we may glean for our day from the ancient myth is that *Cosmos* is a goal for which creative purpose has forever to contend against the corroding and disintegrating power of *Chaos*. The elements of *Cosmos* the Greeks found to be beauty and order and universe; we may take these as examples, if not as a complete picture, of the purposive and rational aspect of the universe.

One product of *Cosmos* is beauty. *Chaos* is the foe of beauty. In *Chaos* there is no beauty. When nature rages with hurricanes, or man rages with moral hurricanes, the beauty of landscape, of homes, of human forms, and of art, is not only ruined but turned into ghastly ugliness. Some are able to preserve their sanity in the presence of this destruction by taking refuge in an ideal world. They argue that *Chaos* rules all existence, but that *Cosmos* prevails in what George Santayana calls the realm of essence; let the houses of all earthly tabernacles be destroyed, the Platonic Idea of *Cosmos* and beauty is eternal in the heavens. This view was touchingly expressed by a German student of philosophy who served as a volunteer in the artillery in the War of 1914.¹

"I continue to be well, although I participated in the battle on October 30, in which the thunder of the artillery of twenty-four batteries almost deafened my ears. Although every moment reminds me that we are at war and in the enemy's country, I am still of the opinion that Kant's third antinomy [dealing with freedom and leading to the idea of a First Cause] is more important than the whole World War, and that War is related to Philosophy as sensibility to reason. I simply do not believe that events in this physical world can in the least affect our transcendental nature and

¹ Tr. from *Logos*, 5 (1914-15), 220.

shall not believe it even if a French hand-grenade should penetrate my empirical body. Long live the transcendental philosophy!"

It cannot be denied that this view has something sublime and moving. Let war destroy beauty, let it destroy humanity, still the ideal of freedom and the principle of cosmic reason will be true.

For some this way of thinking suffices, and to them it seems to be the only possible salvation of beauty and of the whole Cosmos of values in our chaotic world. But nevertheless, it is unsatisfactory, for the simple reason that ideals are not values. The ideal of beauty or of freedom is simply a prescription that beauty or freedom ought to be. If Cosmos ought to be, yet cannot be, then are we of all men the most miserable. If the only hope we can discover is the eternal truth that things ought to be utterly different from what they can be, we delude ourselves in thinking of this as a hope. Instead of being a trust in values, this is a total despair of values—an embracing of the ghosts of beauty and goodness in lieu of their warm living reality.

Before abandoning ourselves to a choice between the ivory tower as the only refuge of Cosmos, on the one hand, and blank surrender to Chaos on the other, we should bethink ourselves of the power of beauty in the world of actual experience. If Chaos were ever destined to annihilate beauty entirely, it has had time enough to win its gruesome victory once and for all. But what are the facts? In the Spring after the New England hurricane, the trees grow, the countryside is green, the ruin is almost hidden under loveliness. Men use their utmost powers of destruction, yet

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row."

In time of war men seek to preserve their art treasures from its ravages, and if they fail, the spirit produces new forms of beauty to take their place. Even now in Canterbury Cathedral, sandbags are piled over the altar and its glories have been hidden. Man's spirit will not surrender beauty to ruin.

The work of natural and human Chaos may seem to leave nothing but devastation; but prophets, poets, dramatists, sculptors, and workers rebuild beauty out of the very materials of Chaos—the most strangely moving of beauties out of the most utter Chaos. Shakespeare made tragic beauty out of Hamlet's story, Goethe made it out of Faust's, Jesus made it out of the whole world's suffering and sin. Beauty thrives in the midst of desolation. The power of those that are with Cosmos is greater than of those that are

against it. There is a perpetual struggle in this universe, but beauty—delicate, fragile as it is—struggles more valiantly than all the powers of Chaos, because the power of beauty is the power of God.

So it is with the principle of order, the second element in Cosmos according to the Greek view. At first glance, not only the mind of the baby, but the mind of the adult, and the face of nature is a scene of confusion. There are chaotic tendencies which seem to oppose all rational order and purpose. The waste and blind alleys in the evolutionary process are instances of this disorder. If order is heaven's first law, as Alexander Pope and the Greeks thought, then heaven does not prevail on earth, either in the jungle or the earthquake or the instincts of man. Yet if we put all of the evidence of disorder together, we find that it does not outweigh the evidence of order. Wherever there is Chaos, there is some law expressed in it and controlling it. Law and order are not set forth in pure spiritual form in this world. They are always in a struggle with Chaos. But they always control it. Chaos can never extend beyond the bounds of law. In the wildest madness of nature or of the human heart, there is at work a principle of form, whether a law subject to mathematical expression or a principle of self-preservation or of adjustment, or a creative power that builds new and higher levels of life and mind. Order torn down is built again. Life stamped out will be born again, as the forbidden corn, which I stamped on in my garden as a boy, grew again. This is a Cosmos of creative order, which moves in and through and in spite of Chaos, dominating it and building eternally more stately mansions.

The commonest meaning of Cosmos—as an equivalent to universe (uni means one, verse means turned—an apparent Chaos turned into unity)—this commonest meaning, I say, is also the hardest for faith,—and the most necessary. That beauty comes after the ugly rages of nature and of man we can see; that there is order in the most chaotic seeming disorder, we learn from scientific analysis and experiment; but that the whole warfare between Chaos and Cosmos is directed by one plan, is animated by one purpose, moves toward one unified, if inexhaustible end—this is difficult for modern man to believe. If he believes it when things go well with him, his faith is often shattered when he beholds the warfare with his own eyes, or experiences it in the circle of his loved ones or in his own person. The principle of Cosmos means that the eternal goal of the universe is a co-operative society of active persons, working in peace and joy and love. The fact is that men who see

this goal most clearly suffer the tortures of Chaos, confusion, and bafflement most acutely. But the myths of old and the repeated experiences of the race should have taught men long ago that ours is not a universe in the sense of being pure, unadulterated, ideal order and unity. The notion that all evil and suffering are merely error, or merely the results of human sin, is neither profound nor realistic. The cosmic unity is not a unity of present perfection nor a unity of unblemished sweetness and light. It is rather a unity of eternal purpose.

Wherever a human soul has come to spiritual maturity, the principle of love, of co-operation, of social harmony and understanding has been taken to be the goal of existence. When the Buddha said that hatred is not appeased by hatred, but by love, he saw the Chaos of life, but also its Cosmos; and he saw that final power lies with the Cosmos of love, not with the Chaos of hate. No spiritual philosophy or religion has ever failed to testify to the struggle of existence and its woe; but reality itself has revealed to seekers everywhere the truth that the purpose of the struggle is a co-operative unity of spirit. If this is at once man's best aspiration and also the eternal goal of the Cosmos, no Chaos will ever thwart it. Many waters cannot quench love, not the waters of T'hom, Tiāmat, Noah, and Thales, flooded together; for love is the Spirit of God that hovers over all Chaos to bring forth evening and morning, light and life.

The third and last point about this potential Cosmos in which we live—where the Spirit of God moves on the face of the deep—is the reminder that the ongoing process of life and the goals for which it yearns are evidence of the immanent presence of the Spirit of God in all things. The striving for beauty and order and co-operative unity which we find in man and in nature cannot be a mere human whim, or a mere product of human will. It is too pervasive. When man's spirit responds to these strivings, it is responding to a Spirit beyond itself, moving on the face of real experience with all its harshness and war. Further evidence of the divine nature and origin of the principle of Cosmos is found in the fact that its expressions in beauty and order and co-operation have met the Chaos of man's inner life and history with inexhaustible resources. If violence seems the only way, spirit always seeks a road of reason and peace. If despair seems natural, hope is supernatural, and is more powerfully real. Reason and peace and hope are forces to which reality responds as it does not to unreason and violence and despair. The divine forces are problem-solving; the forces of

chaos solve no problem. After violence and despair have done their worst, all of the constructive work of civilization and religion is done in rational peace and hope. They are more real than the chaos of violence; they endure as ruling principles of God's will in time and in eternity.

If this be true, then there is a profound further meaning in the saying that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of Chaos. If the Spirit of God had not moved, there would have been nothing but Chaos in the world—no onward movement, no law, no beauty, no light. In the absence of the activation of will, divine and human, existence is indeed without form and void. The Divine Spirit is no distant ideal, no impersonal abstraction. God is love, an active, voluntary, incessant energy of personal power and personal worth. Because God moves, Chaos moves toward Cosmos.

The story in Genesis affords one final insight regarding the Divine Spirit. The first utterance of the Spirit in dealing with Chaos was the command, "Let there be light." It is darkness that makes Chaos seem the last word. Darkness narrows our vision until we see nothing but our fears. Darkness hides the real—but does not affect its solid reality in any way, any more than the fog which cloaks Mount Monadnock makes the mountain itself foggy. Light reveals the perspective of things.

In days when evil is strong and Chaos rages, those who are spokesmen of God may be what the Master said His disciples were—the light of the world. Faith today must exceed the faith of the Scribes and Pharisees or even of the ancient Greek, Hesiod, who said, after all his pessimism about the iron age in which he lived, that "Justice beats Outrage when she comes at length to the end of the race." There is Outrage, there is Chaos, make no mistake about it; but Justice and Cosmos and the love of God rule. When that rule is not evident, the end is not yet.

In Germany today a patriotic Christian, a man willing to fight for his country, lies in prison. I am told by the Reverend Ewart E. Turner that Pastor Niemöller's aged father is preaching many a sermon from Jeremiah 29. 10:

For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith Jehovah, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you hope in your latter end.

And aged Pastor Niemöller adds that Napoleon's mother, seeing her son's glory, said to him, "Es kommt auf das Ende an,"—Everything depends on the end. The end sees Chaos under God's control.

The Church's Contribution Toward a Warless World

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

FOR upwards of thirty years I have devoted myself to international problems. Throughout most of this time I have believed that the attainment of a peaceful world order was exclusively a political problem. As I have studied more deeply I have come to realize that this is not the case. Of course proper political devices are indispensable. But such devices will not be adopted or, if adopted, will not work so long as millions of people look upon State, rather than God, as their supreme ideal.

In order to understand the reasoning which leads to my conclusion, it is necessary first to see the problem as it is presented for political solution.

I start with the very simple and fundamental premise, pointed out by Alexander Hamilton in one of his Federalist papers, that in every community there are men who are ambitious, fanatical and disposed to violence. Further, as Hamilton points out, it is "utopian" to make political plans on the assumption that it will ever be otherwise. Given this premise, the political problem is to organize society so that such men will not dominate a community and lead it into violent and destructive ways. Fortunately, most people are normally pacific and desire to live at peace with their neighbors. The few who, out of love for adventure or lust for power or predatory instincts, tend toward violence are usually a small minority. As such, they can readily be controlled. But at times great sections of a community may come to feel that they are repressed and subjected to injustices. If so, and if they are virile and dynamic people, they then accept a leadership which offers, through force, to break through the restraints and to abolish the injustices. When this happens we have revolution. If the blame for restraint and injustice is placed upon one's own government, we have civil war. If the responsibility is attributed to other nations, then we have international war.

Now society has found political devices which measurably serve to protect itself from developments of this character. We set up a sort of arbiter called "government" which has a dual mandate. On the one hand, it is expected through "police power" to repress individual and sporadic acts of

violence. On the other hand, it is expected to keep this problem within controllable limits by maintaining social conditions such that there will not develop great areas where discontent is rife and a sense of injustice is acute. This is achieved in the main by laws which are constantly being made and frequently being changed so as to provide an equality of opportunity. Even theoretical equality before the law is not sufficient. Ability is very unequal and opportunity is largely fortuitous. It is necessary that both be controlled by law or it would lead to extreme inequalities. Thus we have laws to prevent monopoly, and laws which regulate the exploitation of property which is devoted to public service, such as railroads, utilities, etc. When there are many who are in dire need it may become necessary by taxes on income or estates to take away from some for the benefit of others. This procedure is accepted by the taxpayer who realizes that it is better to be able to enjoy peacefully a part of what he has than to face the violent attack which would be inevitable if his government did not function to alleviate conditions of widespread discontent.

Governments which are even moderately wise and reasonably impartial can maintain domestic order. Of course they do not always do so. We had in France, during the monarchy, and in Russia, under the Czars, governments which denied the principle of equality of opportunity and which drove millions into feeling that the government functioned for the benefit of a few and without any sense of responsibility to the many who were subject to its power. The masses became so aroused as to follow leadership which was violent and ruthless, and which led them into bloody revolt. While these revolts were in sway, the outside communities were shocked and repelled at the horrors and cruelty which were incidents thereof. Today we recognize that the cause lay in the failure of political mechanisms to work. It was that failure which created mass discontent which, whenever it exists, gives violent, ambitious and unscrupulous men the opportunity to become formidable.

Through such experiences as the French and Russian revolutions we have learned the imperative necessity of political devices which assure equality of opportunity and which constantly are at work to prevent conditions becoming rigid and fixed to the advantage of one class and to the detriment of another.

We have failed, however, to give universal application to our political knowledge. As between national groups, there exist no political mechan-

isms comparable to those which serve to maintain domestic tranquillity. Each state is sovereign. There is no superior arbiter to regulate the use of its powers. The rulers of each state seek primarily the advantage of their own people. This is so even though some of their powers directly and seriously affect outsiders. Toward them no responsibility is felt. For example, when the United States raises its tariff, we legislate not only upon those within the country but upon those without, who may suffer widespread distress due to the dislocation of their industries. When we prohibit or severely restrict immigration, we are not only legislating for those within the country but equally putting restraints and inhibitions upon those without. When we put difficulties in the way of foreigners investing here, we prevent them from sharing in our economic opportunities. When we arbitrarily raise the price of silver, we are not merely legislating for the benefit of silver mine owners in the west. We are legislating a distribution of the fiscal regimes of such countries as China which used silver for their currency. When we decide to devalue the dollar, we are legislating not only for our own people but we are breaking up currency relationships upon which depend the industry and commerce of a large part of the world.

I could continue indefinitely to illustrate how the sovereignty system violates fundamental political precepts. As we have seen, power *should* be exercised with regard for all who are subject to that power. Actually the power of sovereignty is exercised to the end of creating, for some, a monopoly of advantage. No responsibility is assumed toward multitudes who are affected. Inevitably there result areas of disaffection, which give men of violence the opportunity to make themselves formidable.

Japan, Germany and Italy furnish modern illustrations of the consequences of such a system.

The Japanese people are people of energy, industry and ambition. Constituting a large population, they inhabit a small area, meager in natural resources. They keenly feel the need for raw materials and for markets. But they have persistently encountered a resistance predicated largely upon the white man's conception of Japanese racial inferiority. Even in China, the Japanese found their trade blocked. England had control of the principal ports and railroads, control of the currency and administration of the tariffs, so that from the standpoint of Japanese economic expansion in China the scale was heavily weighted against her. For many years the leadership of Japan was moderate and liberal. Under this leadership Japan sought

economic and social equality in the world. As this was denied and as the economic position in Japan became progressively more desperate, liberal leadership was ousted in favor of the army war lords who proclaimed that, by force, they would break through the restraints which the Japanese people felt had been thrown around them.

Take Italy. When the World War closed, those in Paris, like myself, who had had some occasion to study the economic and financial position of Italy, could not see how Italy would find it possible to survive. Like all the belligerents, she carried heavy burdens from the war, but unlike England, France and the United States, she lacked the sources of food and raw materials apparently necessary to support her debt-ridden and impoverished population. It was, therefore, no surprise when grave social disturbances quickly occurred. Her liberal leaders were discarded and Communism and Fascism struggled for the ascendancy. Fascism won and the Italian people followed a militant leadership which offered to make Italy powerful and to force France and England to accord Italy that share in the rich areas of North Africa which the Italian people thought had been promised them as a reward for their participation in the war.

Take Germany. It is unnecessary here to detail the severity of the Treaty terms and their many departures from the pre-armistice agreement, in reliance on which Germany had laid down her arms. Secretary of State Lansing, on the day following the delivery of the Conditions of Peace to Germany, wrote: "Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions." This forecast, shared by many at the time, was quickly realized. Yet for fifteen years following the armistice the German people followed liberal leadership under democratic institutions. But the burden continued heavy and the sense of inequality and injustice was rendered more poignant by the economic collapse of 1930. Already then the people were beginning to listen to radical leadership which offered again to make Germany strong and to break the bounds which denied her equality of opportunity. Bruening, the last and perhaps the greatest of a series of liberal German Chancellors, pleaded for Treaty changes which would alleviate the condition of the German people and prevent their falling under the radical leadership of Hitler and the Nazi Party. His pleadings were in vain and the German people finally accepted the leadership and control of the proponents of force.

I do not recite the history of Japan, Italy and Germany with a view to

placing personal blame on the leaders of England, France or the United States. They had a power, in respect of such matters as trade, control of raw materials, markets and money which vitally affected the peoples of Japan, Italy and Germany. They exercised that power without responsibility for the welfare of these other peoples. In so doing, they lived up to the dictates of the sovereignty system.

But if I do not blame these rulers, neither do I place blame upon the Japanese, German and Italian people. They are in the main orderly and peace-loving, quite the equals in this respect of the Americans, English and French. But like any dynamic and virile people, when they fall into economic distress, they rebel against restraints and humiliations ascribable to other states and, like all revolutionists, they then follow leadership which extols violence.

The fault is that of the system. That which has occurred was bound to have occurred. And such occurrences are bound to repeat themselves under any international system which ignores this political axiom: There are always, in every country and at every time, those who are eager to lead the masses in ways of violence. They can be rendered innocuous only by preventing the many from feeling that they are subject to power which is exercised without regard for their welfare and which condemns them to inequalities and indignities.

Now the failure to apply in the international field the lessons we have learned in the national field is not because the problem is essentially different or inherently insolvable. Various solutions are known which offer good chance of success. These solutions generally assume one of two forms, which may conveniently be described as the "league" formula and the "federal" formula. The League of Nations is, of course, the outstanding example of an attempted solution of the first type. Under the League Covenant the nations bound themselves to two essential principles. Article 19 of the League Covenant empowered the Assembly of the League from time to time to "advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." Article 16 provided that in the event that any member resorted to war without first submitting the dispute to arbitration or the council it would be subject to nonintercourse measures applied by the other League members. There was thus present in the League, in theory, at least, the two elements indispensable

to the preservation of peace. There was, first, the obligation to make changes from time to time necessary to prevent that mass discontent which always turns to dynamic leadership and makes it formidable. Second, there was provided collective power sufficient to repress violence which, so long as it is not backed by a great popular movement, is sporadic and controllable.

Actually the League failed because at no time were the dominant members of the League ever ready to give vitality to Article 19, and to revise treaties or to alleviate conditions which obviously threatened the peace of the world. But in principle the conception was sound.

There are, of course, many possible variations of the political formula represented by the League, notably those which call for regional leagues which bind together those states whose powers are particularly apt to be overlapping in their scope.

The second line of political approach is that represented by the federal system. The federal system recognizes that sovereignty is a bundle of powers which do not necessarily all have to be vested in the same entity or exercised with regard for the same group of people. Certain powers, for example, those relating to trade, immigration and money, operate upon a far wider circle of persons than do those relating to sanitation, education, etcetera. It, therefore, vests the first set of powers in a body having responsibility toward a large group of people, while it leaves the second group of powers in bodies responsible only to smaller groups of persons. Our own Constitution is, of course, the best known example of the federal system, but the federal principle is subject to indefinite expansion and has many possible variations. For instance, any number of states might agree that the matter of trade between them was a matter of common concern and, therefore, that authority over trade between these nations should be vested in a body which derived its authority from and had responsibility toward all the peoples concerned. In this way power and responsibility tend to become coextensive and we do away with a condition whereby certain persons are restrained and restricted by power exercised without regard for their welfare.

I have no intention here to advocate any particular political formula. I merely want to make clear that there *are* possible solutions and that there is no reason why we cannot find, for the international field, political devices comparable to those which serve in the national field to prevent that mass discontent which makes quick transition to mass violence.

At the conference at Geneva, which I attended this summer on the initia-

tive of the World Council of Churches, there were formulated certain principles which, it was said, "stand out as clear applications of the Christian message." The first of these was that political power and responsibility should be coextensive. The second was that power should be exercised in accordance with the principle that all human beings are of equal worth in the eyes of God and should be so treated in the political sphere. A third principle was that it is as necessary to effect changes in the interest of justice as to secure the protection of the *status quo*.

These are not merely Christian principles. They are the principles which must be applied within any society which effectively maintains domestic tranquillity. They are principles which can be extended into the international field through mechanisms such as those I have mentioned. But, and this is of the essence, *any* such formula involves some dilution of sovereignty. For example, under the league system a member state may be called upon to contribute to change conditions elsewhere, the continuance of which might endanger the peace of the world. If, for instance, the League had functioned and the United States were a member thereof, we might have been called upon to take a different attitude toward Japanese immigration and toward Japanese goods from that which, purely in our own interests, we had decided to take. It might have been felt that thereby mass discontent within Japan might have been alleviated, moderate leadership preserved and explosion into China prevented. Now any nation which honestly agrees, in advance, to contribute to changes deemed necessary to preserve the peace elsewhere, has deprived itself of some of the panoply of full sovereignty. Similarly, under the federal system, power is divided up as between different bodies having different jurisdictions. There is no single entity which has the majesty of full power. Thus the establishment of a common money might be vested in a body created by and responsible to the English, French, German and American people. This would deprive our own government of exclusive control over a national money and we could not, for example, repeat our 1933 attempt to cure our depression by devaluing our particular money. Any peoples which participate in a league system or a federal system inevitably deprive their national government of certain attributes of power.

It is at this point that we encounter the serious and presently insuperable obstacle. It is an obstacle for which the Church must accept large responsibility. It is an obstacle which, perhaps, the Church alone can dispel. It is

this: To great masses of mankind their personified state is, in effect, their god; it represents the supreme object of their devotion; its power and dominion are, to them, sacred, and to subtract therefrom is akin to sacrilege.

It is apparent that, so long as this sentiment prevails, it is impossible for a sound international order to be established; for any such order requires a dilution of sovereignty as now practiced.

One hundred and thirty-five years ago, here in New England, a group of Christians, comprising the Massachusetts Peace Society, appointed a committee to study the causes and results of war. They found among other causes what they referred to as an "infatuation" and "delusion" by which individuals identify themselves with the nation to which they belong and invest this personified entity with godlike attributes such that its majesty becomes of primary importance. With respect to this cause of war they said: "Should the increase of moral light in the ages to come be in the ratio of that in the past, we predict that this sentiment will be regarded by posterity as one of the most childish and absurd of the present age."

Unhappily it would appear that moral light has not increased in the ratio expected by the Massachusetts Peace Society. A delusion which they expected would be quickly dissipated has on the contrary grown until today it is the most powerful and dangerous force in the world. It is today the formidable obstacle which makes it impossible to apply in the international field those political solutions which work within the domestic field.

How do we account for the fact that this delusion has engrafted itself so firmly upon us? The explanation, I think, lies in the failure of the churches to provide mankind with a loftier means of satisfying its spiritual cravings. Most men are aware of their own finite character and their own inadequacies. They seek to identify themselves with some external being which appears more noble and more enduring than are they themselves. Most men are not purely selfish. They are attracted to a cause which is so sure of itself that it dares to call for sacrifice. Mankind demands a creed through which to achieve spiritual exaltation. This creed *should* be a religious one. But it is not. Our religious leaders have seemed unable to make vital and gripping the concept of God as revealed by Christ. Has the Church, in recent years, called for sacrifices even remotely approaching those called for in the name of "patriotism"? Religion does not become more vital as it becomes softer and

easier. On the contrary, the people lose confidence in a creed, the exponents of which dare not call for sacrifice on its behalf.

It is because of this failure that the false gods of nationalism have been imagined to fill the spiritual need which most men feel.

The present situation is a cause of deep concern to those who genuinely seek a system of world order. Many political leaders, it is true, give only lip service to this concept. To most of them it is a smug formula for advancing the national interest. But there exists in every country an influential group of men who understand the political problem and earnestly and intelligently seek its solution. But, under present conditions, they are impotent. Any sound world order can be achieved only by a major operation upon sovereignty. But you cannot operate upon an entity which is popularly deified.

I have been deeply impressed by the fact that when, as at Oxford three years ago and in Geneva this year, there met together Christians of conflicting nationalities, none of the difficulties between their nations seemed insuperable. They quickly fell into the category of those matters which are calmly discussed and peacefully settled. This is because under such circumstances the problems are discussed purely from the standpoint of the welfare of the human beings involved. What aggravates such problems beyond the possibility of solution is their presentation, not in terms of the welfare of human beings, but in terms of the relative powers and prerogatives of personified nations each of which, by its own people, is looked upon as quasi-god.

Can the Church repair its failure? That I do not know. I am discouraged when I see Christian leaders, in countries which include our own, seeking to identify righteousness with one or another national cause. In many churches the national flag and national anthem today replace the Christian symbols. This seems the easy way. Thereby an anemic church draws vitality from the coursing blood of nationalism. But this not merely aggravates the problem we are seeking to solve. It also exposes a dependence of the churches upon the human rather than the divine. Political leaders are not slow to draw the obvious inference. The Church becomes to them a human institution upon which they can stamp whenever it serves their purpose. This today is occurring in not a few of the so-called "Christian" countries.

The other way is the evangelical way. It requires that we vitalize belief

in a God who is the Father of us all, a God so universal that belief in Him cannot be reconciled with the deification of Nation. This seems a hard, slow way. But it is the way Christ showed. He did not engage in political controversy and had little to say about the functioning of state or even of war and peace. He issued one solemn guide and warning, namely, that we should not render unto Caesar that which is God's. We have come to our present pass because that warning has gone unheeded. All that is best and noblest in mankind has been put at the service of a political mechanism which is human and fallible and which, in its international operation, violates every Christian precept. We have been rendering unto Caesar a spiritual devotion and a sacrifice which belong only unto God. Thereby we have encompassed our own destruction.

There can be no salvation until we have set right the fundamentals. The urgent task of the Church is to restore God as the object of human veneration and to recreate in man a sense of duty to fellow man. National governments must be seen to be what they are—pieces of political mechanism which involve no sanctity and which must be constantly remolded and adapted to meet the needs of a world which is a living, and therefore a changing, organism.

I know that it is difficult to transfer devotion to that which is abstract and universal. I know that it is difficult to enlist sacrifice except by invoking the ideology of combat and of hate. But I also know that mankind is paying a fearful price for its worship of false gods and that never before did the world so need a vital belief in a universal God. That need is the measure of our opportunity and it must equally be the measure of our works and of our faith.

World Christianity: Assumptions and Actuality

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

I

ALL through these recent years the honest attitude of great numbers of Christians toward the missionary enterprise has been compact of belief, uncertainty and doubt. Many were raised in a tradition which revered missions as the spearhead of Christian advance toward the kingdom of God, the chief glory of the Church's service to the world. Of my own generation many had their youthful convictions concerning missions formed in one or another of the great Student Volunteer Quadrennial Conventions and by the dramatic and roseate interpretations of missions there given.

II

In the past quarter-century, the structure of that conviction has begun to weaken and crumble. Misgivings deepened regarding the relation of missions to Western political and economic penetration of the Orient, Africa and Latin America; might it not be that the Christian Movement was the vanguard and ally, indeed an aspect, of Western Imperialism? Then certain specific assumptions were widely prevalent in popular belief:

That missions are working principally in countries of ancient and noble cultures amidst religions older and more mature than Christianity—countries which have profited by the best of modern civilization and are now well able to care for their own peoples.

That the work of missions is predominantly evangelistic in the rather limited and narrow meaning of proselytism.

That the influence of missions is confined largely to the minute fragment of the populations, seldom more than ten per cent and more often one per cent, who have been brought within the membership of the Church.

That missions have succeeded in winning to Christianity a few, a very few, national leaders of first calibre; but that the main success of

missions has been amongst underprivileged and depressed classes with most of the accessions to Christian membership drawn from them.

That the leadership of missionaries, while undoubtedly sincere, earnest, well-intentioned, is for the most part of mediocre ability, of very limited perspective and of dubious effectiveness.

That the significance of the Christian Movement is largely limited to personal helpfulness to individuals; but that the Movement's importance for the life of any nation, even more for the life of the community of nations, is negligible.

Behind and beneath all other misgivings was always the basic query whether Christianity might not be a religion of and for the West, less suited to the nations of the Orient and of primitive life than their own traditional faiths?

There is no place where the acids of modernity have eaten more deeply into the convictions of Christians, even the ministry, than in their confidence in the Christian World Mission.

III

These misgivings and assumptions were vividly present to consciousness when an invitation came to me early in 1938 to be one of the American delegates to the World Missionary Conference at Madras the following December.

However, I had never seen a Christian mission abroad. It seemed absurd that one should go half way round the world to join in planning the strategy of the missionary movement for the coming decade without one bit of first-hand data regarding Christian missions. Accordingly, my wife and I determined to use the six months preceding the Madras meeting to travel as widely as possible among the lands of the East where missions are at work and to see as much of the concrete realities of the Christian Movement in that area as six months would permit.

Accordingly, we set sail from Los Angeles in mid-June, skirting the Pacific basin with brief stops at Honolulu, American Samoa, the Fiji Islands, New Zealand and Australia; then up the easterly coast of Australia to the Netherland East Indies where we spent a month principally amongst the little visited outer islands of this vast archipelago; then on to Singapore and up the eastern coast of Asia with stops at Manila, Hongkong, and Shanghai to Japan. Ten days in Japan were followed by a brief visit in

Korea, a single day's stop in Manchuria, and then something more than a month in various parts of China, mainly the far interior of Free China. From Kunming, we journeyed down the little narrow gauge one-track railway line to French Indo-China, then overland to Siam, by plane to Rangoon in Burma, and on by ship to Calcutta. A month in India, principally Northern India, preceded the Madras Conference itself. Turning homeward at the conclusion of the Conference, we broke our voyage at Suez for a week in Palestine and Egypt. A fortnight in Paris in connection with meetings of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches brought us home in mid-February. In all, eight months of almost unbroken travel, touching five continents and twenty countries over a distance of some forty thousand miles. Through the whole of the period, with only intervals of sea voyage, we were daily observing, criticizing, appraising the concrete actualities of World Christianity in something like one hundred different centers of work.

We set off with very mingled expectations—expectations of anticipation and of apprehension. Of anticipation; how could it be otherwise with so fascinating a pilgrimage in prospect? But also of apprehension lest confrontation with the actualities of the Christian Movement throughout the world should show it largely unenlightened, misguided, ineffective, unwanted, unworthy of support. For we were resolved to ferret out the truth, nothing but the truth, and as far as time permitted the whole truth about Christian missions today—at whatever cost to preconceptions, prejudices or youthful idealization.

IV

Eight months of nearly continuous travel amid lands hitherto unknown inevitably leave as their deposit a wealth of impressions. In this brief summary one can hardly canvass even the most important. The observations which follow will be confined almost entirely to those aspects of the Christian Movement which came before me as corrections or discoveries. Behind each lies what I think to be a fairly widespread misgiving or misapprehension. I shall speak of eight.¹

1. *The Manner in Which Christianity Has Come to the Lands of the East.* In this topic is involved the much-discussed question of the relation of Christian missions to Western economic and political penetration.

¹ It will be noted that these eight observations correspond closely but not precisely to the misgivings and assumptions just mentioned.

Here history shows no simple or uniform pattern. Nevertheless, the overwhelming weight of its evidence is inescapable. Western influence has penetrated the East through three sharply distinguished and often contrasted channels. Western influence remains in the East today in three sharply distinguished and often opposed forms—those of government, of business, and of missions.

Often the chronological sequence in the advent of these three influences has been the reverse of that just given. Not until the history is carefully examined is one likely to realize how often Christian missionaries were the first representatives of Western nations to come among primitive or non-Christian peoples. They came, characteristically, with their Bible, their books, their printing press, their medical kit, their faith, and a firm resolution to give themselves wholly and until death to the peoples among whom they settled. They came without dependence upon the comforts of Western civilization or the protection of Western government. Only later were they followed by representatives of Western enterprise—first, itinerant traders stopping for brief stays to bargain with native peoples for their treasures or to seize their persons, and bearing these away to the huge profits of Western markets; then, merchants establishing semi-permanent centers of exchange; finally in more recent times, Big Business taking control of the natural resources and arteries of trade for wholesale exploitation. Lastly came Western government, sometimes at the behest of traders and merchants for the support of their commercial interests, but not infrequently in response to earnest persuasion by the missionaries in defense of the native peoples. Often the intervention of Western governments was the only possible protection for these peoples against ruthless despoilment and sometimes annihilation at the hands of Western business.

One hears much of missions as the vanguard and ally of Western imperialism and finance. History shows missionaries and merchants more typically at loggerheads, contending for the support of government in behalf of their respective interests in the native peoples—on the one hand, for their education and cultural advance; on the other hand, for their exploitation and cultural subservience.

Nor is this merely a matter of history. All through the East today one meets three types of Westerners—business agents, government representatives, Christian missionaries. Personal relations among the groups are for the most part cordial. Yet they often appear to have meager vital contact

with each other and little in common. Upon the peoples of the East, the three groups make contrasted, when not antipodal, impressions.

The whole situation stands forth in sharp relief in the midst of the present Far Eastern struggle. All over China today a single question is pressed upon the American visitor—quietly and courteously but insistently: "The people of the United States have repeatedly professed their peculiar friendship for the Chinese, are bound to China by treaty obligations, and are said to be almost unanimously sympathetic with China in her present struggle of defense. How do you explain the fact that the American Government has made hardly a move in support of China, and that American merchants are supplying Japan with over 50% of the imported raw materials which are indispensable for her ruthless aggression?" Only one reply is possible: "You must distinguish sharply between American business, the American Government and the finest elements among the American people. American business, after the practice of business the world over, will seek profits wherever they may be had. The American Government, like every other great Power, determines its policy in crucial matters solely by national self-interest. The attitude of the American people, or rather of the finest elements among them, must be judged by the Christian institutions which they are sustaining in China and by their gifts of money and concern and life for China's relief in this time of national need."

In Shanghai, an American representative of one of our largest oil concerns and an American missionary, friends who had been associated for many years in a dozen civic enterprises, were discussing the Far Eastern struggle. The missionary inquired, "How do you reconcile the fact that you have spent your whole life making friends with the Chinese people and seeking to establish the finest business relations with them with the fact that you are now working your head off to sell oil to the Japanese military to be used to fuel Japanese planes in the bombing of China's women and children?" To which the business man replied sadly, "You know we'd sell to the Devil himself if he'd pay cash."

V

2. The Conditions and Needs Amid Which the Christian Movement is Carrying on Its Work.

Many people have their ideas of missions formed from what they know of China, India and Japan—lands of ancient and advanced culture with their own mature and deeply-rooted religions. They imagine missionaries at work

in these countries which they conceive to have already absorbed the best of modern civilization and to be well able to care for the needs of their own peoples.

By happy accident, our itinerary took us first among the outer islands of the Netherland Indies. For the better part of a month we sailed in and out among them on little Dutch freighters with frequent and lengthy stops at tiny island ports. On our trips ashore we mingled with the native peoples in their crowded market places, or wandered through their thatched villages, or drove hour after hour through countryside and forest and jungle, or poked inquisitive but not unwelcome noses into their little shops, or visited in their homes through the open sesame of a missionary's friendship, or conversed with them through man's earliest and still effective language of hands and face. Thus we won some insight into the ways and the inner life and thought of primitive peoples. In this setting, we had our first introductions to Christian missions. Oases of cleanliness, health, education, freedom from superstition, the rudiments of culture, reverence and fellowship amid surrounding filth, fear, degradation and conflict, they seemed. A hackneyed metaphor but one which comes compellingly to thought.

All through inner Asia, straight across the Middle East, in practically the whole of the interior of the vast continent of Africa and much of its littoral, in certain sections of Latin America, widely among the islands of the seas, not to speak of remoter areas in China, Siam, Burma, India and the Near East, there are millions upon millions, hundreds of millions, of men and women and children whose lives are invariably shadowed by disease without healing, by ignorance without enlightenment, by gnawing dread without faith, and who will have none of those things which we regard as the basic necessities of existence unless and until the Christian Church brings them thither.

Anywhere on our earth's surface today, go out to the last outpost of civilization—to the last doctor who is engaged in the private practice of medicine, to the last government school, to the last regular station of the great scientific and research foundations, to the last institution of general philanthropy. Then, from that frontier, go on—on out into the wilderness or the jungle. Ultimately you may come out into a little grass-grown clearing, usually with its three buildings—a hospital, a school, a church; always in its fourfold ministry to human life—to health of body through medicine, to emancipation of mind through education, to general social and community advance, and to redemption of spirit through faith. The Christian Move-

ment is the only world-wide agency for the amelioration of basic human need and the furnishing of the essentials for true living to all mankind.

Nevertheless, we would conceive the role of the Christian Movement in quite false perspective if we think of it solely or mainly in terms of backward peoples. Take medical need in India or China. In the whole of China with its four hundred and fifty millions, there is one foremost center for advanced medical research and instruction. It is the three hundred individual mission hospitals, some of them small centers struggling with meager equipment and resources but scattered widely through the length and breadth of China's provinces, which are actually bringing the relief and the prevention of modern medicine to China's millions. In the city of New York, there is one doctor among every five hundred of the population. In a certain Chinese province there is one doctor with modern medical training for every million people.

Behind these patent and tangible needs there is always the subtler yet far profounder yearning of the human spirit for understanding of human existence, for ideals which shall guide and loyalties which shall command, for inner strength to live worthily under every circumstance, for sustaining and challenging human comradeships, for assurance and realization of Divine Concern, for faith which overcomes. There is the need, little altered by change in outward condition and essentially the same in every culture, for "the knowledge of the Good News made known in the face of Jesus Christ."

VI

3. *The Actual Character of the Work Being Carried On by the Christian Movement.*

It is perhaps only a slightly exaggerated caricature of the conception of missions which lies in the mind of the average uninformed American to picture a well-intentioned but uninspired missionary under a palm tree preaching his gospel to half-naked savages. At least it is widely supposed that the predominant work of missions is the holding of religious services for the sole purpose of winning the auditors to Christian allegiance. And that such medical or educational or agricultural or social projects as missions carry on are distinctly secondary, and justified only as they contribute directly to Christian conversion.

As a matter of fact, the typical Christian mission is not a church (or the shade of a palm tree as improvised substitute) in which a solitary preacher

exhorts simple native-folk to turn from their habitual superstitions and rites to worship the Christian God. The typical mission is a center of three or four buildings—school, hospital, church—from which a team of co-workers with varied gifts and equipment—minister, doctor, teacher, nurse, social worker, agriculturalist—go forth into the community and its environs in multiform but unified service to all who will accept their help.

By no means is this to suggest that alongside each church building is located a hospital. But it is prevailingly true that each church is in effective reach of a medical center. Likewise we are not to imagine quite literalistically that every single church is flanked by a school building and vice versa. It is a striking fact, however, that the inclusive figures for all Protestant missions throughout the world show 55,395 churches and 56,891 schools and colleges. The sum of the matter is—the Christian ministry to the bodies and minds of men is as integral a part of the service of the Christian Movement overseas as is the direct ministry to men's spirits.

One cannot evade the impression that this fact has far-reaching consequences not merely for the influence of Christian missions but also for the health of the workers and the soundness of their work. It is a far sounder church to whose worship there comes the community physician fresh from his exacting responsibilities in the healing of men's bodies, and the community educator held by his vocation to the most rigorous standards of intellectual integrity. It is a far sounder hospital to which the physician returns from the purification and challenge and inspiration of common worship. It is a far sounder school whose director recognizes his task to be one part of the total equipment of the whole life of youth for the full gamut of life's problems.

The Christian Mission is still teaching men to worship the Lord their God with all their hearts, and souls, and minds, and strength. This is the full and authentic Christian gospel. It is also the only program for individual or community which offers promise of true health of body or mind or spirit.

VII

4. The Rootage of the Christian Movement Within the Life and Thought of the Peoples of the East.

This is the problem technically known as indigenization. Behind it lie misgivings of two contradictory kinds. On the one hand, the suspicion that Christianity may be inherently a Western religion, ill-suited to Oriental temperaments and unable to win firm footing within their cultures, that missions

may be at the mischievous as well as futile attempt to foist an intrinsically uncongenial and unwanted foreign importation upon Eastern peoples. On the other hand, there is the apprehension lest the effort to clothe Christian belief and practice in native dress—dress often associated with pre-Christian and non-Christian thought and habits—may involve dilution and even perversion of authentic Christian faith.

I set forth with both misgivings strongly held. I discovered each almost wholly unfounded. On the one hand, the process of the indigenization of Christianity has proceeded much farther than I had any anticipation—in the development of native forms of architecture and liturgy and hymnody, in the raising up of strong national leadership, and in the actual taking over by native leaders from the hands of missionaries of the direction of the Christian Movement. On the other hand, I did not observe a single instance in which indigenization in any one of its aspects has been unsound or threatens the authenticity of Christian life and faith.

"Indigenous churches" are not rare exceptions to be exalted for emulation. They are scattered far and wide in almost every land; more and more they are assumed as embodying the only proper principle for church construction. What is most inescapable in the realm of architecture is taking place less conspicuously but no less significantly in the realms of painting and music and liturgy.

The expressions of Christian faith in native architecture, music, ritual, are merely suggestive of an "indigenization" at once far more thoroughgoing and far more significant, within the souls of the peoples of the East. The Christian faith has entered the inmost fastnesses of their spirits, has won their life's deepest loyalty, has been possessed by them and is now *theirs*, of the very marrow of their true beings.

VIII

5. *The Calibre and Influence of Leadership of Christian Nationals.*

The impression is widespread that Christian missions have labored mainly among unprivileged and depressed groups, that these groups have supplied the great bulk of accessions to the Christian Church, and that Christianity has succeeded in interesting very few men and women of outstanding ability and influence.

It is true that the Christian Movement works predominantly among the neediest strata of society. This is one of many external signs that the Christian

Church abroad is far truer to its major obligation than the Christian Churches of the West.

It is a mistaken impression, however, that, relatively, its most notable influence has been among the needier, and presumably less discerning and more receptive, classes of society. Indeed a strong case might be made for the opposite contention, that it is precisely to the most cultured and highly educated leadership of Oriental nations that Christianity has made strongest appeal.

For illustration one turns instinctively to China. What is so striking in the case of China is no less evident, though at an earlier stage, in the length and breadth of the Christian Mission. What clearer disproof of the assumption that Christianity's main influence has been with the ignorant and the out-cast could there be than the simple fact that, though Christians number only one per cent in China's total population, they are discovered in China's *Who's Who* in the ratio of one in six? However, the quality of national leadership within the Christian Movement itself in China is no less impressive. Here, as at so many points, the Madras Conference revealed the realities of the Christian World Movement in epitome. It was widely remarked among the Western members of the Conference that the strongest single delegation man for man (and woman for woman, since its leader was a woman) was not that from one of the ancient and deeply-rooted Churches of the West, but the delegation from China.

If there are those who still conceive the Christian Movement in "mission lands" as a foreign importation under the direction and control of foreign missionaries with the assistance of a very few especially able native Christians, in the interests of truth it would be well if that conception were dissolved as completely and irrevocably as their childhood fantasies of the Man in the Moon. Visit the headquarters of the National Christian Council, of the Young Men's or Young Women's Christian Associations, of a national Church body, or a typical Christian college in Japan, in India, in China, and to a less extent in other lands. By no overt intimation but by the inescapable teaching of the facts, one learns very quickly who are the responsible leaders of the Christian Movement. One is welcomed, one is entertained, one is enlightened, one is inspired and shamed by that leadership in the persons of Christian nationals of outstanding ability, statesmanship and spiritual perception. In their presence no one could miss the fact that the Christian Movement is a faith and an institution firmly rooted in the life of those lands and growing healthily and normally within their atmosphere under the control and direc-

tion of its own national leaders with the ancillary but highly valued assistance of a relatively small number of missionary advisers.

This is not to suggest that the services of the foreign missionary belong to the past. In this matter, there is only one judgment which can claim authority, the opinion of the national leaders of the indigenous Christian Churches. Among them there is no difference of view. Their unanimous conviction is that more, rather than fewer, missionaries are desired. They should come as servants under the direction of the Christian Movement by which they are invited.

It must not be inferred, either, that the concept of Christian missions has become obsolete. The slight alteration of a phrase well symbolizes a profound reorientation of meaning. The term "foreign missions" is being displaced by "the Christian World Mission." That Mission is seen and accepted as the universal responsibility of all Christians without regard to place or heritage.

IX

6. *The Reality of Universal Christianity.*

The vitality of the Younger Churches and the strength of their national Christian leadership are facts of immense significance not merely for the Younger Churches themselves, but for the health and future of the entire Christian Movement. This significance is at least threefold:—

a. As already suggested, no longer can it be claimed that Christianity among non-European peoples is a "foreign importation." That charge has now become irrelevant and obsolete. Christian faith has so clearly and deeply and immovably rooted itself within the authentic experience of peoples of every continent and race that no longer can there be honest questioning of its "suitability" to them, or of its power to express itself as *theirs* in their spirits and through concepts and forms native to their temperaments and cultures. *The potential universality of Christianity*—its intrinsic appropriateness for peoples of all races and cultures and stages of civilization—*is no longer a matter of theoretical argument.* The "universality of Christian faith" is now proven by the only evidence which could be finally convincing and which is irrefutable—its demonstrated capacity to meet the deepest needs, to win the fullest allegiance, and to become the chosen religion of numbers of representative men and women of every class and type within every principal race and culture of mankind.

b. In certain important respects, *the Younger Christian Churches are already the vanguard, the spearhead of the whole Christian Movement.* To cite four illustrations each of which would merit extended elaboration if space permitted:

1. *The wholeness of the Christian Gospel which impels them, and the healthy roundedness of their Christian life and worship.*

2. *The leadership of youth and of women in the affairs of the Church.*

3. *Secure and vigorous confidence in the authority of Christian Faith and the power of the Christian Movement.*

4. *Conviction of the necessity of Christian unity and resolute determination to achieve tangible advance toward its realization.*

c. *All of this means much for the endurance of the Christian Movement in the world.* If Christianity should disappear from the Western lands where it has been planted for centuries past, it would not disappear from the earth. So deep and tenacious is its rootage in the small but vigorous Younger Churches that it would remain alive in them, continue to grow and expand until ultimately the West would be re-evangelized from the East. Indeed, it is possible that the center of vigor and outreach for Christ's Cause is actually shifting from the Older Churches to the New.

X

7. *The Competence of Missionary Leadership.*

A single word must be added about the missionaries. It is widely assumed that they are men and women of sincerity and earnestness but of mediocre abilities, limited perspective and doubtful effectiveness. The missionaries themselves would be the first to insist upon their very meager gifts and accomplishments.

An initial impression upon the visitor is that, in the large, here is a corps of solid, energetic, "B" grade men and women. Further reflection when one returns home, especially comparison with leadership here in government, business, commerce and education as well as religion, convinces one that, on the average, the guidance of the missionary enterprise is in considerably abler hands than that of parallel endeavors in this country. If there is ground for dissatisfaction, it is only because the extraordinary difficulty and importance of almost all mission posts demand and warrant services of superlative competence.

Among the total force of missionaries are persons of quite exceptional strength and influence. To cite a single illustration: the man who is piloting Yenching University in Peiping, almost the only institution of higher education now open in "occupied" China, through the indescribably tense and testing days of the Japanese invasion, is not only an inspiring teacher and gracious Christian; he is one of the ablest and greatest living American educators and one of the wisest and most redoubtable "ambassadors" this nation has ever had as spokesman of its friendship for another people.

Inevitably, the great bulk of the missionary force are of "B" grade capacities. However, a further comment should be added. There is a strange alchemy in this Movement. It has the power to lift quite ordinary people to extraordinary service and influence. All over the world one comes upon them—men and women of modest equipment and training performing tasks of exceptional difficulty and importance with wisdom, competence and unfailing modesty. The most convincing proof of this is the positions which, almost uniformly, are accorded them in the esteem of the peoples among whom they serve, especially the foremost leaders of these peoples, whether Christians or non-Christians. When one travels to the East, he is well advised to take letters of introduction to every type of persons there—to nationals of course, to business people, to government officials. But if he really wishes to come into the most intimate and enlightening contact with leaders of the countries, to meet them in their homes rather than in their offices and upon a basis of immediate frankness and mutual confidence, he should take introductions to the Christian missionaries. Above all others, the missionaries hold their trust, their esteem, their affection, their profound gratitude for unstinted and unseeking services to the welfare of their people.

XI

8. *The Significance of the Christian Movement for Individual Nations and for Mankind.*

Most people, whether without or within the Church, conceive its influence almost wholly in terms of spiritual helpfulness to individuals and communities. Its importance for national or international affairs they assume to be inconsequential.

Our survey revealed cause for serious qualifications on that impression. We discovered Christianity as inescapably a factor of great and perhaps decisive weight within the life of nations. And in very diverse situations—as the

civilizing agency for a whole people in the Fiji Islands; as the only mediator of healing, learning, morality, spiritual ideals amid tribe after tribe of primitive folk; as the chief source of leadership for public service among a suppressed nation like Korea; as the mightiest single force in the regeneration and emancipation of the most populous of all nations in China.

Nevertheless, the larger question presses: has the Christian Movement any measurable importance for the vastly more complex and confounding issues of international conflict? What is most needed for the realization of that fairer society of nations for which, even in this hour of holocaust, men still yearn? Surely two things pre-eminently: the raising up into leadership in nations all over the world of men and women deeply committed to the achievement of world peace even at the price of national sacrifice; and the creation of a structure of international life to express and conserve the community of nations. The first of these the Christian Church is doing, day in and day out; indeed it is the only agency raising up world-minded leadership throughout the world. The second seems almost beyond the possibility of hope now, certainly beyond the possibility of action. Yet, even now, as an earnest of its possibility and foretaste of its reality, there stands one world community drawn out of all the nations.

Let us turn once more to the Madras Conference because it so well discloses World Christianity in miniature. There are no auspices other than the Christian Church under which such a conference could possibly have been held. For there is now no other movement or organization or fellowship which has living units among the populations of practically every nation on earth. There are certainly no auspices other than the Christian Church under which such a representative world assembly could have met in the year 1938 or 1939. For there is no other movement or organization or community which is able to bring together in conference and fellowship representatives of the peoples of the whole world, overpassing every barrier which otherwise sunders them.

Thus were disclosed and symbolized these great truths about the Christian Movement:

Christianity has become at last a world movement: that movement is today the only living, growing, powerful world movement.

The Christian Church has become a Universal Church: that Church is today the only World Community.

For it is simple truth that in our shattered and confused and apprehensive world there remains one and only one unshattered, undaunted, resolute world community

of men and women: it is the world-wide movement of Protestant and Orthodox Christendom.

As the Madras Conference itself was bold to affirm, "By faith, but in deep assurance, we declare that this body which God has fashioned through Christ cannot be destroyed."

XII

It will be suggested that the interpretation of the World Christian Movement here given is altogether favorable, quite "too good to be true." It is an honest report of the impression made by that Movement upon a single observer who approached it with grave forebodings and who applied to its every aspect the calculus of a highly critical mind. Doubtless there are many weak and even harmful aspects of that Movement. Doubtless there are pieces of missionary endeavor which are unworthy of support; though, in critical scrutiny of close to a hundred centers in twenty lands, I saw not one, and heard of only one. Doubtless, there are instances of missionary service which is mediocre and uninspired; though relatively they must be few.

It would be an exaggeration to say that the only rays of light piercing the gloom of our world's present outlook come from the Christian Movement. But it would be an exaggeration of the truth. There is no other force spread widely through our contemporary world and disseminating through the whole body of humanity influences for the righting of its wrongs, the healing of its deepest maladies, the bridging of its divisions, possibly even the halting of its fatalistic descent toward conflict and chaos. There is no other agency reaching out toward every corner of the earth, toward every people and every aspect of human life—for health and enlightenment, for reconciliation and redemption. There is no other institution or movement which still holds together the shattered fragments of the body of humanity, as an earnest to all men of what God intended the life of mankind to be and what some day the family of nations may become.

The world-wide Movement of the Christian Church! There is nothing else like it in all the world. The truth is there is nothing which can so much as be compared with it. With all its divisions, its inadequacies, its apostasies, it is today the greatest power for the uplifting of the life of humanity in every aspect and for the building of a fairer world which this planet has ever seen. Its powerful advance, with incalculable benefit to mankind, waits upon our realization of that FACT; for it is a fact. And then, upon our appropriate response to that fact.

The Intellectuals' Crisis in Religion

HAROLD BOSLEY

MANY contemporary intellectuals find themselves in an enervating and altogether hopeless predicament. This is their problem: How to guide their lives by personal and social purpose in a world which they feel to be devoid of ultimate meaning? The confused state of their quest for a purpose sufficiently compelling to integrate their loyalties speaks for itself. Some seek to solve the problem by excessive activity within their special fields, and are known in the earlier stages as "promising young thinkers" and in the latter stages as "tired young intellectuals." Others, like John Reed, lift high the banner of some great social cause and endeavor to rally their confused comrades round it. All too few realize that one of the perennial functions of the Christian religion has been to rescue intellectuals from precisely this cul-de-sac; that it has the light and leading they so sorely need; that it is languishing for lack of what they have to offer as truly as they languish for lack of what it can contribute.

Quite naturally, the concept "intellectual," reflecting the confusion of the intellectuals, has many meanings in current usage. As I shall be using it in this paper it connotes neither disparagement nor commendation. It is, rather, an attempt at accurate description. *The intellectual is one who strives to see phenomena in their context.* He believes that the objects of his interest can be understood only when viewed as integral aspects of a larger whole. The nonintellectual, in contrast, is content to take things as they come. He inquires into the whence and whyness of their coming and the witherness of their going only in so far as such inquiries facilitate immediate adjustment. The intellectual rigorously insists that these are fundamental questions and must be answered up to the limit of our information if even immediate adjustments are to escape the category of guesswork, if not sheer opportunism.

Aristotle disposes of the nonintellectual in a single, cutting sentence: "He who takes only a few things into account finds it easy to pronounce judgment." Matthew Arnold's celebrated description of Sophocles may well be taken as the end and aim of all intellectual endeavor: "He saw life steadily and saw it whole." When Thomas Aquinas defines God as Perfect Intellect he means simply that God sees the causal strata of creation—past,

present, and future—as a vast totality, one unified panorama unfolded before Him. This, of course, is Ideal Intellection and, by definition, open only to God, the Omniscient.

Although our entire educational procedure is now under a withering fire, much of which is richly deserved, it has been and continues to be one vast laboratory for the nurture of intellectuals, of persons who are trained to see some phenomena, at least, as aspects of a larger whole. It is only fair to say that the sole reason for the professional existence of professors and the books they write is their ability accurately to indicate perspectives on fields of facts. The expert is one who sees the underlying, the more comprehensive, relationships of a special field. The geologist moves from a stone to a stratum to a formative epoch in the earth's crust. The social scientist begins with an institution, say the family; he considers it from the angle of its development; he contrasts the form which prevails in our culture with that which obtains in others; he considers the disruptive tendencies within the present institutional structure such as divorce rate, later marriage age, and changing moral conventions regarding sex behavior.

And so it goes throughout our educational system. It takes as freshmen persons whose perspective on various phenomena is narrowly limited and plans to graduate those who have known the thrill as well as the chill of re-treating horizons. The fundamental aim of education is to emancipate us from the atomicity of sensation. This it does by teaching us to seek the meaning of the things we experience, believe, and strive for in their broadest context. The leaders in the field of education are coming to agreement on the point that, if education is to escape the provincialism of specialization, it must result in a world view, a conception of the total life enterprise.

Needless to say, education so conceived is immediately beset by the peril of accepting some one world view as final and devoting its energies to securing acceptance of that viewpoint. An apologist is notoriously deficient in self-criticism. An educational system that is long on exposition and evangelism is bound to be short on comprehension and criticism. The school systems of totalitarian regimes are a case in point. They teach a world view, one dictated by political, or economic or national considerations. History and science are rewritten, not to mention falsified, in order to bolster that world view. Consequently the products of these schools are not so much intellectuals as addicts.

We who are interested in religion heavily underscore the notion that

the intellectual has fallen short of his logical development unless he finally arrives at a world view. But we are incorrigibly suspicious of any known world view that is so rigidly complete that it tries to give the lie to the value and validity of growth through experience. In other words we feel, to adapt the thought of the Pilgrim Pastor, that "new light" is always breaking forth in the area of human experience. We must keep on insisting that every world view must have a growing edge, that it should not be placed above and beyond the criticisms of cumulative experience and reflection. Therefore we must insist that the quest of the intellectual is not and cannot be considered complete until and unless he has come to terms with the place and meaning of religion in his world view. This is precisely what most intellectuals have not done. We can safely say that the most far-reaching crisis which confronts them today springs from their indecision and ignorance regarding religion.

Some intellectuals regard it as dangerous and worthy of extermination both because it is surcharged with superstition and because it impedes social change. Religion has been guilty of these crimes at certain times in history, but that it has always played and must necessarily play this role is manifestly false to anyone who studies with care any of half a dozen historical epochs.

Other intellectuals, like George Santayana, regard religion as a form of poignant art and feel that as such it deserves its board and keep. But this limited view of the scope of religion can be maintained only by the indefensible procedure of overlooking or minimizing those creative ethical insights of religion which at different crucial periods have rocked empires and refashioned social structure in general. I refer to (1) the prophetic reforms in Judah in the seventh century B. C.; (2) the alterations within the Roman Empire due to the impact of Christianity; (3) the sweeping Cluniac reforms in the direction of checking the ravages of feudal warfare in the early eleventh century; (4) the Lollard movement in England in the fourteenth century which was a vital feeder to the English Reformation; (5) the Wesleyan movement in the eighteenth century with its profound social reverberations.

And then there are other intellectuals, like T. S. Eliot, Christopher Dawson, and Rosalind Murray, who accept some specific form of religion as the true interpretation and use it as the basis for reinterpreting life as a spiritual enterprise. They lay their critical abilities, historical insights, and social passion on the altar of religion so conceived and consecrate them to its service.

Thus we see trained minds in the arts, sciences, and philosophy ignoring,

rejecting, tolerating, and embracing religion. And it is both because there is no other conceivable alternative and because intellectuals find themselves willy-nilly choosing one or the other of these that they must rethink the problem of their relationship to religion.

Yet, it is simple enough to understand why the intellectual, trained as he is in either arts, sciences, or philosophy, moves warily when he approaches religion. For religion has had several pitched battles with all three disciplines within the last five hundred years. These major periods of conflict continue to loom large in modern culture: the Renaissance, when religion, proud mistress of the minds and souls of men for fourteen centuries, found herself challenged by a revolt of the entire range of the arts; the Enlightenment, when philosophy, emboldened by the rich fruition of minds like Bacon, Descartes, Hume, Kant and others, drew up and made good her declaration of independence from religion; the Nineteenth Century, when scientific method laid profane hands on the problems of the origin and nature of man, a province hitherto gladly left to religion. In none of these ages did religion quietly abdicate. Led by doughty warriors whose zeal for the faith of their fathers far outstripped their appreciative insight into the values of the opposition, she plunged into the fray. Not only were the torments of hell paraded before the eyes of the unbelievers, but generous samples of what it would be like were served here on earth. It is a long, dark, sickening story, but it does illustrate why intellectuals are wary of religion. They would rather, in Edmund Gosse's delightful phrase, "let sleeping dogmas lie."

Nevertheless, intellectuals, individually and collectively, can be rescued from aimlessness only by getting a firm grasp on two emphases that are fundamental to religion: (1) human values are neither optional nor arbitrary but are organic to the universe; (2) the achievement of these values is a social process. When I say the intellectual needs these religious affirmations, I am, of course, assuming that when he surveys the human scene, he is moved to do something about the problems which harass men. If he can survey the agony and unrest of our day with the detachment that enabled Goethe to watch Napoleon storm and sack a city and only marvel at the manifestation of sheer force exhibited, then the intellectual has a very limited and definitely irreligious perspective on the life-enterprise. It is wholly beside my present point to try to convince intellectuals that they ought to do something about the problems which agitate men. Limitation of space and subject compels me to assume in the first place, that they see at least some of them,

in the second place, that they want to do something about them, and third, that they wonder what religion has to offer under the circumstances.

The first thing it offers is the insistence that the human values indicated by the great class concepts, Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love, are not simply human constructions but indicate certain actual and possible relationships between man and the rest of nature. Life as it expresses itself in and through man is a definite yet dynamic thing. It streams into the future, yet does not lose its identity. Its genius is its forward thrust along lines determined both by its own nature and by what the environment permits. It is a half-truth to say, as religious humanism does, that life is a bundle of desires, the other half being that these desires depend for their fulfillment upon the nature of both the human organism and the environment. We desire food, yet the desire *per se* is no guarantee that food will be forthcoming, nor is it any assurance that what we call food will be healthful. Most of us will unhesitatingly affirm that health is a human value, yet it is far from a purely human construction. It is in reality a very complex pattern of interrelationships between man and his world, involving breathing, eating, drinking, sleeping, playing, working, and many complicated physiological processes. While we may define health any way we please we cannot be healthy by doing anything we choose, *unless we choose wisely*. Life speaks the final word on all our definitions.

All of which is fairly obvious in the realm of health, yet the fundamental principle involved in it applies to the great values mentioned earlier: Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love. They are human reactions in so far as they represent our groping efforts to discover and clarify the meaning of life, actual and potential. Yet they do not stream forth from human life like a flag from a flagpole, unattached at the other end. Rather they are attempts to describe a relationship which does exist in some measure and may through wise choices and purposive living exist in greater measure. Wherever and whenever you find life, regardless of form or level of existence, you find adaptations designed to sustain and promote the continuity of the structure. Though life on the human level is so complex that we, with all of our science, have only begun to explore its mysteries, it manifests that same primal urge to sustain and promote itself by adjustments to the environment. Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love are ways of describing certain types of adjustments, certain modes of relationship, which we have discovered in part, and which invite further exploration and experimentation.

And there are other concepts, opposites of the ones just mentioned; deception, ugliness, meanness, and hatred, which likewise connote certain relationships which man can and does sustain to the world. And the difference between these two sets of relationships is determined by what happens to life, yours and mine, when it is enmeshed in them. The relationships gathered into the categories of Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love progressively enrich life; they move in the direction of the more abundant life; one in which the capacities of men are discovered, nurtured, and brought to rich fruition; one characterized by health rather than sickness, wisdom rather than ignorance, brotherliness rather than condescension, understanding rather than prejudice. Conversely, the relationships which are instances of deception, ugliness, meanness, and hatred progressively strip life of meaning and worth and finally destroy the very thing they feed on.

The Christian religion centers attention upon the value-structure of the universe, calling it God, and insists that the abundant life flows from one type of interaction with this rather than another. To the doubter it can only say: try and see. If you can be healthy without conforming, consciously or not, to the laws of well-being which are implicit in our personalities; if you can enjoy deep friendships without conforming, consciously or not, to the laws governing personal association which, though we know them only in part, are implicit in our structure; if you can create the Great Society, that social structure which seeks to discover, nurture and bring to rich fulfillment the creative energies of man, without paying strict and humble attention to the laws of personal and social growth which are implicit in human beings and societies—in short, if you can succeed in living a full and abundant life governed by the hypothesis that

"I am the master of my fate
I am the captain of my soul"—

then religion has nothing more to say. Religion has never paid much attention to verbal atheism—to the man who says there is no God; but it has always been profoundly stirred by ethical atheism—by the man who acts as though there were no God. It has consistently submitted its fundamental conviction that there is a value-structure implicit in nature to the test of action, of life. "By their fruits shall ye know them."

Religion offers the intellectual a way, and the only way, out of the be-

¹ This paragraph is quoted from the author's *The Quest for Religious Certainty*, pp. 172-173.

wilderment and cynicism which so easily beset him by confronting him with a categorical imperative, *a consciousness of work to be done*. It is idle to talk about "purposive living" apart from a sense of *oughtness*, a conviction of Purpose in Life, which is its very foundation. Something worth living for, something worth committing oneself to, body, mind and soul, something worth dying for swims into the ken of the intellectual when he couples with his vision of work to be done the profoundly rational and mystical consciousness that the reason it ought to be done derives from the very structure of the universe as it comes to expression in human life. He will appropriate as food for his spirit Dean Inge's trenchant insight that "Homage to the ultimate values is the worship of God."

This, then, is the first and the great contribution of religion to the intellectual: his purposes and the Purpose of God can coincide, for, as Whitehead reminds us, "The Purpose of God is the achievement of Value in the temporal world." The second contribution can be stated this way: the achievement of human values is a profoundly social process.

The Christian religion is not only prepared to recognize the point now agreed upon by social psychologists that we are children of nature, and that our self is a social creation, but it pushes on to make that most profound of all affirmations of our social nature, namely, that we are sons of God and brothers one of another. It draws a single staggering ethical corollary from this affirmation: the only way to approach God is by serving, through love, our fellow men. Ethical religion, then, is a call to action, social action, in terms of problems, social problems, in the name and for the sake of God, the value-structure of the universe. "No one observatory is equal to the tasks of astronomy," says a famous astronomer. Neither is any one man, or group of men, or culture equal to the task of discovering the fuller meaning of Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love in terms of the problems of our day. This is a shared undertaking, broad enough to include and profit by the contributions of all sincere and intelligent men everywhere. It lays every sensitive spirit and discerning mind under obligation to share the best that he has without thought or restraint or reward and to continually refine what he thinks best in the fires of life. If these great values are to be anything more than ivory towers in which we hide while storms engulf the world of man, then all men who are in search of them must join hands.

One of the noblest instances of goodness of which Chicago boasts is Hull House. Although we always, and rightly, think of Jane Addams when

we think of Hull House, it far transcends the work of any one person's hands. One of Jane Addams' long suits was her ability as a social engineer; for she channeled into her project the hope, aspirations, and aid of unnumbered thousands of others. Hull House is what it is today because it is the product of the shared efforts of all these folk. Without some such institution those hopes, aspirations, and efforts which have gone into its effectiveness would have been ephemeral, inchoate, useless. When gasoline explodes in a chamber created to conserve its power, appropriate action results. If it explodes anywhere else, a flash, heat, and smoke occur, and it all adds up to either destruction or uselessness.

The great religions of the world are great precisely because they have mastered this principle of the production and direction of human energies. Without exception they have created a "body of believers," a Church, which not only strives to evoke mystic rapport with God and make a rational statement of its faith, but which, in addition, turns the energies thus generated toward the solution of social problems. Such an organization molds the believers into a mystic whole which is pre-eminently practical in that the unique contribution of each believer is integrated in and directed by common loyalties and goals. The organization trains its leaders and educates its members in the faith, and constantly reconsecrates itself to the cause it serves.

The Christian Church with all its faults, and they are many and grievous, is the social institution in our culture which is dedicated to the task of making the ethical insights of the Christian religion socially effective. Many intellectuals feel that the Church is so immersed in traditionalism, so entangled with the *status quo*, that it cannot speak an effective word toward social reform. Believing this, they must then choose either to forsake the ethical meaning of religion and attempt to confine it to a way of thinking and a mode of feeling, or they must attempt the incredibly difficult task of founding a new social organization capable of conveying the ethical implications of religion to society. This latter alternative is acceptable, if and only if, the Church of our day is beyond redemption.

Before relegating the Church to the museum, the intellectual should spend some time studying the present state of the Church. When this is done, he cannot avoid seeing two facts: (1) more water has gone under the bridge of religion in the last twenty-five years than in any other quarter century since the Reformation; the entire church structure, ecclesiastical, theological, and ethical, is in a condition of rapid and epoch-making change;

(2) the Church, with its profound prophetic tradition, is one of the few institutions protesting and capable of protesting against the exploitation of human values by social and political organizations for narrow and vicious ends.

Apropos the first act, mention should be made of Charles Beard's survey of significant trends in American life and institutions in the last two decades, *America in Midpassage*. Nowhere does he make mention of the developments in policies and politics that have been stable for a century or more. He, like other intellectuals, either does not know or has made no attempt to evaluate the far-reaching implications of a multitude of movements, for example: (1) the growth in importance of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the World Council Movement in America; (2) the rapidly rising educational standards for admission to clergy; (3) the organization of Committees on Social Problems, the Councils for Social Action and similar organs for keeping the churches alert on social issues; (4) the rapid spread of religious work on college and university campuses; (5) the increasing amount of co-operation among religious groups, epitomized by the National Conference of Jews and Christians. How far these and related movements will go depends, of course, not alone on the quality of clergymen but even more definitely upon the quality of the laymen who will rally to their support in a realistic manner.

Nor can intellectuals blindly ignore the plain truth of the second fact: the Christian churches have been one of the strongest bulwarks against the ready realization of the totalitarian goals set by various governments. We should not claim too much for the churches in this matter but neither should we claim too little. Long after the labor organizations, dissenting political factions, and the educational system had been "co-ordinated" by the Nazi government, the "church-problem" remained *and remains today* as one of the great unsolved internal problems in all such states. This simple fact, which causes no surprise in one acquainted with Christian history, confronts the intellectual with a challenge that he cannot ignore with good conscience.

Then, too, the churches are producing some of the most incisive critics of contemporary trends in civilization. The Oxford Conference studies² are as valuable a critique of the modern world as can be found. They dispose of the notion that the Church is entangled to the point of hopelessness in the social milieu. They also demonstrate the reality and value of the religious perspective on human events and problems. The differences of opinion which

² Publishers, Willett, Clark & Company.

they contain are expressions of vitality and growth rather than disintegration, since they are contributions toward the achievement of a deeper unity among divergent movements in Christianity.

The realistic way in which the World Council has gone about the task of bracing the churches for the shock of the war that is now raging must commend itself as one of the significant advances of the last twenty-five years. The firm reaction of the churches to the restoration of the legal basis of the liquor business is that of an institution which senses its mission and is prepared to carry it out by educational, legal and spiritual means. The increasing facilities for bringing the influence of the churches to bear upon policies in recreation and politics alike bespeak a vigilance that will prove valuable.

The point I am trying to make is that the Church is not only in existence but is also in motion, and needs a clearer sense of direction as well as more power and courage. I do not see how the intellectuals can long ignore these facts if they are actually in earnest in their determination both to understand more fully and influence more deeply the swift moving events of today.

I hope I have not given the impression that the intellectuals are simply to be on the receiving end of religion. That would be untrue. The Church is far from perfect. Organized religion needs the intellectuals as badly as they need its affirmations and its fellowship. It needs their information, their ability to approach with disciplined method and thought those areas which they are studying; it needs the tremendous potency of life—past, present, and future—which throbs through their training and personalities. They can bring objectivity and information about concrete problems into the area of religion; these alone can beat down some of our superstitions and prejudices. Religion in turn can bring confidence, conviction, and humility into their life, giving the challenge of worship and comradeship in purposive living.

The intellectuals' crisis in religion, then, is brought on by the fact that they must choose between these alternatives: either reject religion and wander about in a world where values are optional or arbitrary and where nothing really matters, where, as one who chose this course said, "After all, life's quite pointless, isn't it?"; or accept the insight of religion as to the cosmic nature of values and the social nature of their realization, and throw their total energies into the Church, reforming and energizing it, enabling it to regain a position of vital leadership in the creation of that society which will yet come into existence on this, our earth, providing always that we have courage and humility enough to yield to the formative purpose of God.

Protestantism and the Origins of Modern Science

A. S. NASH

SEVERAL writers of eminence, notably A. N. Whitehead and Max Weber, have emphasized the fact that in the history of culture the emergence of the scientific movement is peculiar to Western civilization. It is not that the capacity for profound thought or patient observation has been absent elsewhere. The astrologers of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar made a series of stellar observations which were hardly inferior to those of Tycho Brahe in the sixteenth century and in the light of which they were able to predict accurately eclipses. The skill in dyeing and smelting of the Egyptians in the time of the Pharaohs shows clearly that they had a wide range of factual knowledge in the fields of chemistry and metallurgy. A Greek, Euclid, produced his *Elements of Geometry*, and for two thousand years his work provided the unchallenged model of mathematical proof. The unique feature of modern science in Western Europe is that if 1543, the date of the publication of Copernicus' *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Orbs* and Vesalius' *Fabric of the Human Body*, is regarded as the year of its birth, then, within three short centuries—John Dalton died in 1843—there came into existence a movement which gathered within itself all that was known of the natural world and developed it to an almost incredible extent.

The question naturally occurs: What was the concomitance of circumstances which enabled Western Europe in the middle years of the sixteenth century to give birth to a movement of such profound significance in the history of man? There is no better starting point in trying to answer this question than Whitehead's chapter on "The Origins of Modern Science."¹

Whitehead's main contention is that the most striking feature of the modern scientific outlook, as it was revealed at its birth in the sixteenth century, was the "union of passionate interest in the detailed facts with equal devotion to abstract generalization." Hence he rightly sees the problem as being: "Why did there emerge at the close of the Middle Ages the instinctive faith that there is an Order of Nature which can be traced in every detailed occurrence?" He maintains that the origin of this conviction that every par-

¹ *Science and the Modern World*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

ticular event can be correlated with its antecedents in a fashion which exemplifies general principles lay in the long dominance of European thought by the Scholastic Tradition. He goes on to argue that the particular element in Scholastic thought which produced this faith was the idea that God possessed both the personal energy of Jehovah and the rationality of a Greek philosopher. In other words, Whitehead finds the intellectual sources of the scientific outlook in the development under the influence of Greek rationalism of the Judaic conception of a living God. He adds that certain sociological considerations also contributed toward the rapid development of the scientific movement: Roman law established in the Western mind the ideal that an authority ought to be both lawful and law enforcing and, in addition, exhibit a rationally adjusted system of organization; the art and learning of Constantinople acted both directly and indirectly as a spur to culture in the West and prevented it from being fettered by static and traditional ways of thought; and the interest of the Benedictine monasteries in agriculture as an alliance between science and technology kept "learning in contact with stubborn and irreducible facts."² Such, according to Whitehead—to use his own metaphor—was the seed and the soil from which modern science grew. To him factors such as the invention of printing, the increase in wealth of the Italian cities, and the taking of Constantinople were but fertilizers.

Although Whitehead's thesis has been often quoted uncritically by writers on behalf of religious propaganda, it has in the main been rejected by serious thinkers. Morris Ginsberg,³ for example, suggests that Buddhistic metaphysics rather than Scholastic philosophy would be considered, *prima facie*, more sympathetic to the notion of law in nature. There are two replies to such a criticism. The first—given by Whitehead himself—is that the conceptions current in Asia of the relations between man and the world did not encourage the same confidence in the scrutability of nature as was engendered by the theology of medieval Europe. Whitehead does not argue that this confidence was logically justified even on the basis of that theology; his concern is simply to show how it actually arose. The second reply—the basis of which will be seen more clearly when we come to show how Whitehead's thesis should be modified—is that Buddhism and Hinduism alike both encourage a contemplative attitude toward the natural world and so make impossible that reliance on experiment without which modern science cannot

² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³ *Studies in Sociology*, p. 11.

exist. Of Buddhism, W. C. Dampier-Whetham truly writes, "Buddha founded his system of love and knowledge, and a respect for reason and truth; but these tenets, favorable to science as they might have been, were neutralized by the other components of his philosophy. The transitoriness and vanity of personal existence were emphasized; self-annihilation and loss of individuality were made the condition upon which the attainment of spiritual completion depended. This attitude of mind, by distracting attention from all immediate surroundings, tends to arrest that desire for material matter which is often the incentive leading to an advance in practical scientific knowledge. But the gentle art of healing was consistent with the Buddhist religion, and for this reason, perhaps, the works of Atreya and Susruta with their stores of medical learning have survived."⁴

Ginsberg's second criticism is that "the notion of a necessary natural order is more likely to have arisen by way of a reaction to that of a personal God ruling by the fiat of His will than as an unconscious and natural derivative of it."⁵ This criticism ignores the fact that, although according to the Scholastics God was personal, yet His ways were as rational as any Greek philosopher would have wished them to be, and hence could be discovered by man and reduced to intelligent formulation. Thus Copernicus could proclaim that his task as a scientist was to think God's thoughts after Him.

Another critic, Abraham Wolf,⁶ also maintains that Whitehead was fundamentally mistaken in seeing any connection between the Scholastic *Weltanschauung* and the growth of the scientific temper. Against Whitehead's contention that science was organically related to the rationalistic outlook of medieval thought, Wolf argues that the reasoning of the Scholastic was always kept within the bounds of premises based on authority. They never attempted to exercise, nor permitted others to exercise, reason in such a fashion that it aims at embracing the whole of human experience unrestricted by the boundaries imposed by traditional dogmas. Modern science, on the other hand, argues Wolf, was based on a return to the implicit reliance on natural knowledge which characterized the ancient world. The appeal to experiment was largely prompted by the naturalistic attitude as exemplified in and encouraged by the recovered literature of pagan antiquity, in contrast with the supernaturalistic attitude of the Schoolmen. That is why, continues Wolf, science is universal, whereas the churches are not, since science imposes

⁴ *History of Science*, p. 9. Published by The Macmillan Company.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 11.

⁶ In *History of Science, Technology and Philosophy in the 16th and 17th Centuries*.

no arbitrary restrictions on the scope of reasoning, whereas the churches usually confine it within the arbitrary boundaries of their several creeds and dogmas. Wolf describes the contrast just indicated in another way, by urging that the naturalistic view expects regularity in Nature but the supernaturalistic view is prepared to find miracle and magic in natural phenomena. He then goes on to consider other differences between the outlook of modern science and that of medieval thought. These differences arose from the fact that Scholastic thought is based on one set of Greek ideas, whereas that of the pioneers of modern science is based on another. Scholasticism had set up Aristotle as its authority on matters which did not involve religious dogma. The founders of modern science followed the earlier Pythagorean tradition which laid supreme stress on number. Hence, concludes Wolf, "the Scholastics followed Plato and Socrates for whom explanation lay in the discovery of the ends or purposes which things served, the indication of what they were good for. . . . Medieval thought ran riot in the invention of fanciful things which ends were alleged to serve. The ends imagined were usually human ends. This kind of teleological explanation thus tended to encourage the homocentric prejudices of the Middle Ages. Everything was conceived as having been intended to be designed to serve some human need. . . . Modern science started by rejecting and still rejects, as far as possible, teleological explanation. It embraced the method of explanation advocated by Democritus and the other atomists, explanation by reference to the causes or conditions which produce things, their efficient, and not their final, causes."⁷

Thus Wolf's position can be summed up by saying that modern science, in appealing to the facts of observation, was simply making a return to the Pythagorean tradition in Greek thought which expressed a naturalist philosophy as over against the supernatural philosophy of the Scholastics, which had been erected on the basis of Aristotelianism. For this reason the Scholastics were obsessed with teleological explanations in terms of human ends and purposes, whilst their homocentric attitude of mind was rejected by the early scientists of the sixteenth century who gave up the attempt to answer questions of "why" in favor of questions of "how."

Wolf's theory, however, fails, as incidentally does that of Whitehead, to account for the emergence of that feature in the scientific outlook—the appeal to experiment—which distinguishes it both from Scholasticism and the whole of Greek thought. To suggest, as does Wolf, that reliance on experi-

⁷ *Loc. cit.*, p. 5.

ment by the early scientists originated in a return to the mental attitude of Pythagoras or Democritus, is to misunderstand entirely the difference between the typically Greek attitude of mind and that of the scientific movement. Wolf's dismissal of Aristotle as an example of a scientist in the modern sense of the term is equally applicable to Pythagoras and Democritus, both dominated by the speculative attitude of the typical metaphysicians.

In so far as Hellenistic thought ever approached what the modern mind calls scientific method it was inevitably infected by its exaggerated trust in deductive reasoning. In Greek scientific thought as a whole it was considered that the only value of induction was as a necessary preliminary to true science which was deductive and must therefore be cast in terms of syllogistic logic. But syllogistic logic is almost useless in experimental science where not formal proof from accepted premises but discovery of new facts is the aim. Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle alike deprecated any appeal to experiment on the ground that it was vulgar. The Greek ideal of science was essentially intellectualist. The goal of the Greek mind was to contemplate reality as an intelligible order. The practical results of science, therefore, were of secondary importance; in fact, to the typical Greek thinker the application of science to mechanical ends was a mark of intellectual immaturity, since the end of science was not to do but to know. The structure of geometry, built upon alleged self-evident propositions, was looked upon as the model of all true thinking and hence even Archimedes, the only real experimental scientist of the Hellenic age, was intoxicated by the deductive approach.

It might be argued that the advances which the Greeks made in astronomy show that they were not entirely ignorant of the need for experiment. But this is not an argument against the above estimate of the Greek attitude toward science. Actually it is one in its favor, since passive observation is not the same thing as active experiment. Logically it is impossible to distinguish between experiment and observation, but the psychological difference between the two attitudes is substantial and it is with this that we are here concerned. The difference between the divergent mental attitudes of observation and experiment is plainly related to the practical differences between the two methods. The former involves no manual control of the objects under examination, whereas the latter does. Hence astronomy can be cited as an example of an observational science and chemistry as an experimental science, and for this reason the Greeks developed astronomy but ignored chemistry.

The strength of Wolf's criticism of Whitehead is that he sees clearly that

modern science was the product of a revolt against the medieval outlook. This is not to suggest that Whitehead was unaware of this fact. Indeed, he specifically refers to it as "a sensible reaction to the rationalistic orgy of the Middle Ages." What he fails to do is to examine the question why the revolt took place and what was its nature. Wolf's answer is that "the medieval lack of interest in natural phenomena and disregard of individual judgment had their roots in the domination of a supernatural outlook, an other-worldly mentality. The earth was of little interest in comparison with heaven, the present life was at best a preparation for the life hereafter."⁸ But to find, as does Wolf, the source of the revolution whereby the present life occupied the center of man's picture, simply in a return to the naturalism of the materialist tradition of Democritus, is inadequate; for the reason that none of the early scientists, Kepler or Galileo, for example, were naturalistic in outlook. Wolf really had the true answer at hand when he mentions⁹ the fact that the scientific movement flourished (although it did not originate) in Reformation countries like England and Holland.

Two centuries before Galileo's epoch-making experiments, Roger Bacon had pointed out that the fundamental obstacle to the growth of man's knowledge of the natural world was an intellectual dependence on authority, which carried with it the refusal to experiment. He found from his own experience that it was useless for isolated individuals to set their faces against the Scholastic world view. A movement which could enlist widespread support for a revolt against traditional authority was essential. The central thesis of this article is that Protestantism, being a religious movement in a religious age, could challenge Scholasticism successfully, both in the ecclesiastical and in the intellectual spheres. The Protestant Reformation produced a mass movement of men prepared to question traditional authority and willing to accept revolutionary ideas as the intellectual basis for investigating the world of nature, and that is why it was able to accomplish what neither Roger Bacon nor Leonardo da Vinci had been able to do.

Moreover, this intellectual basis itself was unconsciously provided by the Protestant movement. The essential character of medieval theology against which Protestantism revolted was pride in man's achievement. Experiment to the Schoolmen was unnecessary: man knew the truth, for example, about falling bodies; his only concern was to work out the implications of

⁸ *Loc. cit.*, p. 5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

what he already knew. The stars, being heavenly bodies, were known to be perfect, hence to look at them was a waste of time. The reaction of a typical Reformation thinker, Francis Bacon, against medievalism, is well expressed. To use his own words: "The error of the Schoolmen proceeded from a too great reverence, and a kind of adoration of the mind and understanding of man; by means whereof, men have withdrawn themselves too much from the contemplation of nature, and the observations of experience, and have tumbled up and down in their own reason and conceit. . . . For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh always to the stuff and is limited thereby; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and brings forth indeed cobwebs of learning, admirable for fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit."¹⁰ But the appeal to experiment, however, it based upon the acceptance of man's ignorance and a consequent willingness to refer questions to objective fact. The behavior appropriate to such an attitude of mind is action in the shape of experiment. It is this acceptance of the primacy of action over speculation which shows that the scientific revolt was based upon a "Judaic" rather than a "Greek" attitude toward the relation between knowing and doing. For to the Jew, knowledge always had relevance to practice, whereas to the Greek the highest values in knowing were revealed in contemplation. As Robertson Smith points out, "When the prophets speak of knowledge of God they always mean a practical knowledge of the laws and principles of His government."¹¹ It was Protestantism, therefore, which by returning to a Judaic rather than Greek attitude provided, psychologically, even if not logically, the scientific movement with its methodology.

It is interesting to note that even J. M. Robertson admits that Protestantism "set up outside its own sphere some new movements of rational doubt which must have counted for much in the succeeding period." Hence, "we find . . . in the more systematic and more cautious argumentation of the abler Protestants of the seventeenth century a measure of general rationalism more favorable alike to natural science and to Biblical and ethical criticism than had been the older environment of authority and tradition."¹²

The second contribution which Protestantism unconsciously made to the progress of the scientific movement was through the high significance it gave to manual labor. A recent historian of ancient science, Benjamin

¹⁰ Quoted by J. H. Robinson in his contribution to *John Dewey: The Man and His Philosophy*, p. 158.

¹¹ *Religion of the Semites*, p. 23.

¹² *A History of Free Thought*, pp. 509ff.

Farrington, argues that¹³ in Greece the aversion to manual labor must have operated to the detriment of science, since the experimental scientist cannot dispense with his hands. Farrington illustrates his argument by pointing out that anatomy stood still from Galen to Vesalius. Vesalius himself explained this intellectual stagnation as due to cessation of dissection by the intellectuals who as free men had a contempt for manual work. To quote his own words, "It was when the more fashionable doctors in Italy, in imitation of the old Romans, despising the work of the hand, began to delegate to slaves the manual attentions they deemed necessary for their patients . . . that the art of medicine went to ruin. . . . When the whole conduct of manual operations was entrusted to barbers, not only did physicians lose the true knowledge of the viscera, but the practice of dissection soon died out, doubtless for the reason that the doctors did not attempt to operate, while those to whom the manual skill was resigned were too ignorant to read the writings of the teachers of anatomy."

By its doctrine of "the calling" Protestantism encouraged that attitude of mind whereby physical labor or work could be construed as a vocation on earth which met with God's approval. Thereby it set its face against the Greek view, which had been carried over into medieval thought, that physical labor was too vulgar an occupation for the intellectual. R. L. Calhoun describes the change as follows: "Against the regnant monastic ideal of the Medieval Church, which held up the lives of celibate clergy and religious orders as more pleasing to God than the lives of ordinary folk engaged in doing the ordinary work of the world, Luther and Calvin followed and overpassed the lead of certain mystics and medieval preachers in applying to these common pursuits the impressive term vocation, that meant 'divine calling.'"¹⁴ Calhoun goes on to point out that Thomas of Aquinas used "die Berufsidee" in the sense of a concept of the individual's labor as contributive to an organic whole" and that he "effected a significant advance in the understanding of the value of work." But, argues Calhoun, although Thomastic social theory gives clear "recognition of positive worth in the providentially ordered array of occupations which serve not merely the higher orders but the common weal," yet "Saint Thomas never applied to the doing of *opus manuale* (secular labor in its widest sense) the distinctive terms *vocare*, *vocatio*; nor did he ever grant to those engaged in such work a level (*gradus*) of life

¹³ *Science in Antiquity*, p. 228.

¹⁴ *God and the Common Life*, p. 17.

comparable to that of the orders set apart to engage in *opera spiritualia*.¹⁵ The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith meant that man was to be reconciled to God in this world and not merely in heaven. Thus religion was secularized so that, as Luther put it, the shoemaker should shoe the Pope as religiously as the Pope should pray for the shoemaker. This attitude of mind is well expressed by Kepler in a prayer which he used in concluding one of his astronomical works: "Behold I have here completed a work of my calling with as much of intellectual strength as Thou hast granted me. I have declared the praise of Thy works to the men who will read the evidence of it, so far as my finite spirit can comprehend them in their infinity."¹⁶

It might be argued, in answer to the importance here attributed to Protestantism, that the Reformers were not more friendly toward the scientific attitude of mind than that of the Church against which they rebelled. It could be mentioned that the first martyr of science, Servetus, was burned at the stake by Calvin, and that the early scientific movement was strongest in Roman Catholic countries. But this reply rests upon a misunderstanding very much akin to the criticism, that the Reformers were not more friendly to the spirit of capitalism than the Roman Church, which is often leveled against Max Weber's well-known thesis on the relation between Protestantism and capitalism. The connection between Protestantism and the rise of science on the one hand,¹⁷ and Protestantism and the emergence of capitalism on the other hand, is not to be conceived as being a conscious process. It was simply that in both cases Protestantism removed the dams of medieval restriction, and both Calvin and Luther and their supporters were quite incapable of checking the course of the subsequent torrent which made possible the era of liberal individualism, that "Geist" which in religion produced the innumerable Protestant sects, in thought the scientific movement, in politics democracy and in economics capitalism.

There are many connections between the rise of capitalism and that of the scientific movement which, in conclusion, should be mentioned. Both rest on "rational calculation" as to future behavior and both involve the willingness to forego immediate expenditure of resources. This latter appears

¹⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 284.

¹⁶ Quoted by Charles Singer in his article in *Science, Religion and Reality*, p. 141. Although Kepler was not technically a "Protestant" he was very much under the influence of its thought and entertained many ideas which from the Catholic standpoint were heretical.

¹⁷ I am not aware of any investigation by Max Weber on this question; the only reference to it in Weber's translated work is in his *General Economic History*, p. 368, where he points out that in his judgment the specific contribution of Protestantism to the progress of science was to have placed it at the service of technology and economics.

in capitalism as saving for the purposes of capital accumulation, while in science it appears as experiment in the utilization of present materials not for immediate satisfaction but for the light thrown on the properties of all materials which are of that type and which will appear in future experience. But the most important resemblance between the two lies in the fact that they both represent a break away from ethical considerations. As Tawney points out,¹⁸ the most fundamental difference between medieval and modern economic thought consists in the fact that, whereas the latter normally refers to economic expediency, however it may be interpreted, for the justification of any particular action, policy or system of organization, the former starts from the position that there is a moral authority to which considerations of economic expediency must be subordinated. Similarly, E. A. Burtt points out that the idea of law as "a rationally discoverable principle of unity behind processes of change" could not have been "foundational to the thinking of large masses of men had it not proved possible, in the great medieval era of Anselm to Aquinas . . . to combine what was essential in it with Hebrew conception of divine law."¹⁹ He goes on to say that "crippling complications still infected the picture and had to be purged before the whole faith of science clearly emerged." The purging needed, adds Burtt, lay in the fact that "the Christian conception of God was that of a being morally perfect as well as rational" and that "as long as the interpretation of the world was attempted in theological terms the presupposition could hardly be avoided that everything must happen for the sake of some good." Hence, concludes Burtt, science could not develop until it had set free its thinking from the assumption that everything that happened took place for the sake of some good.

We now see that the Protestant movement, in expressing a revolutionary attitude toward human knowledge, furnished the foundations for the scientific world view. It was able to do this by taking its stand on the Jewish attitude toward nature as good. Expressed in the doctrine of the goodness of creation, this attitude was a direct protest against the Greek contempt for the temporal world which had its origin in a preference for the world of pure and rational being, a preference which reappeared as Christian theology developed, until in Scholasticism the Biblical view of creation was almost submerged. It was only when Protestantism had re-emphasized the Jewish elements in the Christian tradition as over against the predominating Greek

¹⁸ *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 39.

¹⁹ *Religion in an Age of Science*, p. 42.

elements in the medieval synthesis that the interest in nature, without which experimental science was impossible, was able to emerge.

Thus Protestantism was indirectly responsible for the collapse of the medieval synthesis, even though it can hardly be held responsible for the intellectual synthesis based on natural science which replaced Scholasticism. In any case, Protestantism was bound to oppose Scholasticism, since the very essence of a Scholastic system is that it has no place for new facts and consequently represents the attempt by man to attribute final and ultimate authority to one of his own creations. In other words, medieval Scholasticism proved itself to be a species of intellectual idolatry. Like any other idol it found itself inadequate for the demands made upon it. It collapsed as an intellectual synthesis precisely because its basic separation between the truths of reason and those of revelation was simply the reflection in thought of the impassable gulf which, as we have seen, it placed between secular work and specifically religious activities. In practice the method adopted to bridge that gulf was calamitous in learning and in life alike. It meant that theologians claimed the right to dictate what scientists should teach, just as, for example, ecclesiastics claimed the right to decide for the merchants how they should conduct their business.

Hence natural science and economics have developed by way of reaction as autonomous spheres. The outcome has been tragic, for thereby was created the spiritual roots of the self-sufficient scientific-capitalist mentality which has dominated modern man. As a result, he has been so intoxicated by a concern with immediate means that instead of construing them as means toward an ultimate and transcendent end he has regarded them as ends in themselves. He has found himself concerned more with the part than with the whole, and so have arisen such typical modern clichés as "art for art's sake" or "business is business." But the Christian, on the contrary, must believe that since all things were created by God, man lives in a "universe" and not a "multiverse." Hence to him this liberal view of knowledge is ultimately a kind of intellectual polytheism and it is therefore no more satisfactory than the intellectual idolatry of Scholasticism whether ancient or modern.

Nothing indicates more clearly the influence of this intellectual polytheism than the position of Christianity in the universities of the liberal democracies of Great Britain, the United States of America, France and the Scandinavian countries. The liberal university deliberately rejects any explicit attempt to teach a unified conception of the world. The natural sciences

have dictated the predominant modes of thought to such an extent, both inside and outside the universities, that it is no exaggeration to say that veneration for the scientist is only equaled as a monument to human credulity by the respect of the Middle Ages for the priest. The fundamental tenet of this dominating scientific world view is that science is concerned with facts and not with values. The contemporary liberal university is for this reason content to be an efficient center for the distribution of factual knowledge, disclaiming any responsibility for the creation of a coherent philosophy. Indeed it is the proud boast of such a university that its aim is to teach "facts"—science without metaphysics, history without propaganda, and economics without political bias. Philosophy and theology as traditionally understood thus inevitably appear strangers in a strange land, for they both sought to encompass in their grasp the whole choir of heaven and furniture of earth. The prevailing fashion in philosophy, "logical positivism," regards this ambition as the most profound mistake of which the human intellect is capable. It has therefore sought, and, in the analysis of the meaning of language, found a field within which philosophy can follow, to use Kant's phrase "the sure course of a science." Theology too, since Schleiermacher, has claimed autonomy by insisting on freedom to interpret its own specific subject matter in terms of its own categories and not those of metaphysics or history. Thus Walter Horton, after referring to such thinkers as W. E. Hocking and H. N. Wieman, goes on to say: "Common to all these thinkers is the tendency to regard God provisionally at least, not as a Being behind and apart from the world of experience, but rather as a Being revealed *in* human experience, a Dependable Factor in it which can be isolated by scientific analysis just as one isolates chemical elements or bacteria or vitamins." This is the final absurdity of the liberal theory of knowledge, for God is the ground of all things and it is therefore ridiculous to regard Him as an "object" suitable for scientific investigation.

So completely has the modern synthesis based upon science collapsed. It is not surprising that the younger generation find themselves increasingly attracted by the newer Scholasticism of Marxism and Fascism as philosophies which can bring order and unity to a chaotic world.

The question before Protestantism therefore is whether it can create a *Weltanschauung* which steers a middle course between the Scylla of the totalitarian—Scholastic view of life and the Charybdis of the liberal conception. Such a *Weltanschauung* cannot be the creation of professional theologians, since they usually regard theology as the study of the history of the

thought or the literary criticism of the Bible or a specialized study of the "ecclesiastical" aspects of history, rather than as an attempt to furnish a synoptic account of God, man and the universe. The demand is for Christian thinkers among scientists, historians and philosophers who, while rejecting the right of theologians to dictate their conclusions, can yet relate them to a theological understanding of human destiny. So much are the Protestant churches the children of liberalism that such thinkers are rare. The natural scientist tends to believe with A. S. Eddington that there is no clash between the scientific and the religious approaches to reality, since they never meet. The economist legitimately views economic science as being concerned with the relationship between the ends of human action and scarce means which have alternative uses, but too often, as with Lionel Robbins, he relegates the ends themselves to a subjective realm in which the question of whether a course of action is right or wrong is incapable of rational examination. Historians rightly attempt to work out their conclusions independently of their religious affiliations, while philosophers witness to the value of the critical pursuit of truth and refuse to buttress the doctrines of religious organizations or political parties. Seldom, however, do Christian philosophers or historians perceive with Berdyaev that although the Christian thinker is not called upon to make his conclusions conform with orthodoxy, whether Catholic or Protestant, he must strive as a follower of Christ, to acquire His attitude toward the historical process. The Christian scholar's approach therefore must be fundamentally different from that of his non-Christian colleagues.

Thus the Protestant churches, perhaps in co-operation with other non-Roman churches, are called upon to create an order or fellowship of lay-theologians who would consciously make it their aim as Christian intelligentsia to create a Christian world view within which the conclusions of the specialized sciences would take their rightful place. Such a movement will be dialectical in thought since, like Scholasticism, it will derive its unity from its theological basis, but it will differ from it in that theology, as man's attempt to understand God's revelation of Himself, will have no right to dictate the conclusions of scholars engaged in "nontheological" branches of study. God, not theology, is sovereign. It is not that there would be no place for theology in this future Christian *speculum mentis*, but unlike the clerical theology of the past, Protestant and Catholic, this new lay-theology must be related to and illuminated by the wider setting of the modern man's knowledge of the universe in which it will take its part but to which it will give ultimate meaning.

Christian Citizenship in Action

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

MY TOPIC might not unreasonably be supposed to forecast something on the order of a detailed schedule of specific reforms which the churches should sponsor for practical furthering of the kingdom of God in our complex social situation. There are two reasons, however, why I prefer not to approach our subject from that angle.

The first is that I distrust my competence. I am not without fairly definite ideas of my own on social issues. Nevertheless, the more I study sociology, the more I feel that I know little about it. Such conclusions as to ways and means as stand firm in my mind lack even for me the certitude beyond experiment and question which should belong to any course of action deserving official endorsement by any church.

The second reason goes deeper. I have been disillusioned as to social cure-alls. And I am gravely apprehensive of the consequences to faith of any identification of the eternal gospel with any platform of social reform.

I am disillusioned because I am old enough to remember the days when evangelical Christians in America very generally anticipated a golden age from two measures which have subsequently been put into operation without bringing anything like the millennium. When I was a boy, we thought we knew that as soon as the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as beverages had been enacted into law the main cause of vice, poverty, wretchedness, and unrest would have been removed, and its results would in consequence rapidly disappear. We also thought we knew that political skulduggery would become a thing of the past when at length the suffrage was given to women. For the higher moral sense of women would, as it were, automatically clean out the Augean stables of the bosses and their gangs. Since then, prohibition has come and gone. Perhaps it will come again. But meanwhile its dubious results have combined with other factors in general experience of the past quarter-century to show us that alcohol is by no means the only troublemaker in modern society. Woman suffrage also has come, and no one doubts that it will remain. But all it has accomplished beyond doubling the electorate has been to demonstrate what should have been evi-

dent anyway, that women on the average are very much like men on the average, neither brighter nor duller, neither better nor worse.

It is doubtless by these and kindred observations forced upon our reluctant acknowledgment through the years that many of us have been put sternly on our guard against any writing down of the ineffable and glorious mysteries of God in Christ into terms of mere political and social advocacy, however well meant or well advised. What we object to is not reforms, or that Christians should be concerned for them. It is reformism, or the notion that a Christian's religion can be measured by the footrule of that kind of altruism which deals with the externals of human life, and approaches hearts only from the outside.

Two terms once widely current in this connection are now falling generally into disuse, in fortunate illustration of this return from the superstructure toward the foundation of faith. One of these terms is the "social gospel." The gospel has imperative social implications. We will never forget that again, I trust. But the gospel itself is not social; it is personal. The other is the use of the word "crusade" for hot advocacy of a social reform in Christ's name. Perhaps our recent revulsion from that term is due to our having paid more heed to the lessons of history, since perplexity as to the obscure causes of the War of 1914-1918 turned our scrutiny upon the remote past. We have learned what a crusade really is. The crusades of the Middle Ages were mere excursions of baptized banditry, invasions of civilized lands in the Near East where Christ was not acclaimed, or where He was acclaimed in Greek rather than in Latin, by barbarians who knew not Christ, either, save as the name of a tribal god who encouraged them to plunder. We shall continue, I hope, as religious men, to make war upon evil wherever we see it with the most effectual weapons and strategy we can find. But I trust we will never again claim that our strategy and our weapons in pursuit of tentative and often beclouded approximations to human betterment are the very weapons and strategy of our crucified Lord, with His unlimited backing for our limited wisdom and hazardous objectives.

Faith without works is dead. No man is a Christian unless he is a Christian in action. And Christian action will always be directed upon the problems raised by human needs. There are practical problems of two types in this connection. With the theoretical problem, which only God could solve, as to whether in a given instance the needy are morally deserving of help or not, no follower of Jesus can properly concern himself. For our

Master's example suffices; and Jesus went about doing good, as it were indiscriminately. He proclaimed unmistakably by His works of mercy upon all and sundry that every needy person deserves help simply because he is needy. There are no undeserving poor, though help may have to be given in different ways to different people so that none shall be unmanned by our injudiciousness.

The first practical problem raised by human need is that of relief. This is simply a matter of discovering the really needy, assembling the wherewithal to satisfy their need, and administering it to them with such tact that the effect will be to set them on their feet and start them out again under their own power if they are still capable of it. That work is what we call charity or social service. It began with the churches. Most churches still keep it up; but on a reduced scale, for the social agencies have latterly come into the picture to do the job more extensively and more thoroughly. The social agencies sometimes become so secular in spirit that their ministries are a mere impersonal application of the case method. Nevertheless, Christian citizenship projected them in the first place, while it is Christian motivation in the general citizenship which still maintains their budgets. Relief work may not get down to the root of the matter, but on the surface and from day to day it is so vital that chaos would swiftly ensue in our cities upon its cessation. Christian citizens can find no immediate outlet for the energies arising from their faith more urgent than to work in and with the social agencies, preserving them from dry rot by imparting to their businesslike routine an ever-fresh infusion of the spirit of Christ.

It is the second problem raised by human need which gets down to the root of the matter. This is the problem of the social causes of poverty, disease and vice, and how to counteract and correct them. In contrast with social service or direct relief, this is what we have taken lately to calling social action. And it is here that we enter upon controversial ground. There is controversy, first, as to what these causes are, and the techniques for removing them. There is further controversy as to the kind and degree of responsibility of the Church, that is to say, the organized Christian fellowship as such, for their removal; and, before they can be removed, for taking sides in the inevitable arguments as to what precisely they are, and how they should be handled.

Now I repeat that my purpose here is not to offer, from the particular standpoint which I occupy, a problematical social diagnosis as the basis of

a still more problematical prescription for the reordering of society in whole or in part. Even if I had arrived to my own complete satisfaction at such an analysis and such a prognosis, they would still be predicated upon my particular standpoint. And I do not believe that this standpoint is adequate for the Church, though it must needs suffice for me. Social action is a region of much heat, but not as yet of much light. Every Christian citizen ought to make up his mind as clearly as he can for himself on these issues, and then put in his efforts for betterment in line with this personal conclusion. But in doing so he will find that there will be many of other churches, and of none, who stand with him, and many in his own church who as honestly disagree; while the type of action called for is manifestly political and partisan.

Every proposal for social reform is partisan in organization and undenominational in appeal to all men of good will. But every church must be true to its own theological and devotional standards. It cannot be true to them unless it be so utterly nonpartisan in politics that no men naturally adhering to these standards shall be driven out of its communion by any political stand irrelevant to them. Therefore, official endorsement by any church of a positive civic platform with controversial planks seems to me to be a betrayal of its highest loyalty and duty. At the same time, refusal by any churchman to come in the light of his faith to the political conclusion which seems right to him, in line with the most comprehensive information he can get, and to participate in partisan action accordingly, is just as grave a dereliction from the duty he owes to the Christian ideal of loyally seeking its social embodiment.

This is admittedly a paradoxical situation. What is enjoined upon the churchman is forbidden to the Church, and vice versa. Yet I can see no way out of the difficulty save to face it squarely, and ask ourselves what the Church can do, under these limitations, to encourage and enable the churchman to do his duty positively, under the guidance of his own conscience, as a citizen. Is there a region of social action lying behind politics and partisanship, which the Church should effectually occupy, in order that all the conflicting judgments of honest men Christian at heart may be equipped and energized for the political contests out of which, as we believe, the truth and the right are likely to emerge gradually?

I hold that there is indeed such a region. There are three things which the Church can do and must do for all her members, in order that they may be active for the public right as they see it. The first is to sensitize all Chris-

tian consciences to public wrongs. When every Christian is made as restless and unhappy by the fact of condoning and exploiting injustices in group living profitable to his private estate as by the sting of remorse for some dirty private sin, then there will be a dynamic in our social idealism which will drive it beyond talk.

The second derives from the first. In order to see his duty as a citizen and to set about doing it in any way, a man must be shown what the situation is, with all pertinent facts on both sides of the picture. The Church can have a big job of social education for all her people if she wants it. And she had better want it, failing other like provision in the community. For she will be cheating in one of her main obligations if she avoids it. Obviously the pulpit is not the place for documented lectures on capital and labor, for instance, or housing, or the like. But facts on such matters must be made available for guidance of the Christian social conscience. And there are classrooms and midweek meetings now available or which could be added, under competent leadership, for these purposes.

Not many ministers know enough about such subjects to teach them, though many ministers ride some reform hobby hard without any reins of documentation. But not many churches are so isolated from the experts that some social scientist could not be found to come in at the minister's invitation and teach pastor and people many things we all need to know in these connections, plus a way of objective approach to facts, and a sliding scale of the veracity of sources to protect us from propaganda, which would forestall much angry and harmful dogmatizing upon hasty impressions and snap judgments.

The teachers brought in need not be members of our own churches. The history teacher in the nearby high school, for instance, is often the student of the social sciences closest at hand. He might be thrilled to be offered such an opportunity for self-development through instruction to adults, irrespective of denomination.

When a teaching program along these lines is put into any reasonably wide-awake church, with due preliminary publicity, it is usually a rebuke to the pastor's doubtfulness of any response to find how many will enroll, and will say that this is the very thing they have been looking for, in these troubled and confusing times. To be sure, a few will always howl at the outrage of such discussions in what should be exclusively a spiritual—that is, a tame and sentimental—atmosphere. But that is also a sign of life.

Of course a church need sponsor such a program only when it is not already offered under other auspices equally satisfactory, as for instance in a neighboring church or a school or college extension course. Moreover it will generally be better for the churches to hand over a project of this sort to the community at large as soon as the pioneering stage is past, and the common demand has been made self-conscious by what some enterprising church has started. But the pulpit will need to implement its adjurations to social conscientiousness by specific and pointed endorsement of any such provision for basic nonpartisan social education which the community may provide.

The third thing which the Church has to do in the realm of social action lying behind the divisive politico-economic debates of the day is a task which she can delegate to no one else. And it is essential to all that we traditionally hold most dear in Church and nation. The pulpit must elucidate simply, convincingly and repeatedly, line upon line, in all sorts of contexts, the principles of human conduct and intercourse which are implied and integral in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

When I speak of the gospel of Jesus Christ, I mean that Jesus Christ Himself is the gospel. To be more specific, I cannot identify the gospel with any intellectual scheme for its interpretation. As an amateur of theology I am greatly interested in all such schemes. But surely they are all secondary. What is primary is our blessed Lord Himself; or, in a sort of psycho-theological shorthand extension of that statement, Jesus' way of looking at life and reacting to its contacts and challenges. Jesus' way—it was good news for the world when He exhibited it. Jesus' way—it is good news, or call it emancipation or a new birth or what you choose to heighten the effect of this phrase, for every man who, relying upon God's grace, embraces that way for his very own. And this gospel—Jesus' way of thinking and acting—involves and exemplifies certain principles which are the sole and indispensable safeguards of sanity and improvement in human relations. It is not a social gospel; nevertheless there are social principles in this personal gospel which we must realize in our own hearts and keep forever before our people.

I cannot think of a better way of stating those principles than by treating our topic, with its three key words, as if it were a text: "Christian Citizenship in Action." "Christian" means to us all, I hope, not something creedal or institutional to begin with, but simply "Christlike," which is another way

of denoting Jesus' way. First, then, in expounding this text, let me combine its first term with the third, and speak of Christian action.

Is action what God wants of Christians? Or are they only to bear witness to Him? Will He work with us toward all just aims, so that we can expect in partnership with Him to reach them? Or does He disdain human agency, and throw His weight into history only by direct intervention when human efforts have inevitably eventuated in frustration and despair?

We had supposed that this issue was settled long since. But it has been raised again, with an intimidating apparatus of critical learning, in the mood of sophisticated antirationalism, by the movement now spreading rapidly from continental Europe through the English-speaking countries, which calls itself the crisis or dialectical theology. Karl Barth is its father, with Soren Kierkegaard as a sort of godfather in the dim distance; but most of its proponents today disclaim Barth's leadership. Indeed Barth in his recent phase seems happily to have foresworn it. At Madras last December I was astounded to note what inroads this learned revival of an ignorant antisocial obscurantism has already made in supposedly respectable quarters. I predict sorrowfully that there will soon be a mighty swing among emotional American preachers toward the extreme right occupied by this neofundamentalism which proudly claims to be a new orthodoxy.

The crisis theology, of which we are thus likely to hear much more in the near future, insists that God sustains only a vertical relationship with our world, and never works in it horizontally, that is, through men. Human action is doomed to catastrophe; Christian witness can but forewarn the elect, while consoling them with the prospect of a miraculous apocalypse beyond. Christian social action is then a vain pretense, a formal contradiction of the allegedly Christian view of God as the Wholly Other.

It is interesting to speculate on how such a reaction has come to gain its present wide and growing currency. I venture the suggestion that it arose as a mere temperamental divagation of its originators, but has spread because it offers a convenient rationalization for a cowardly retreat from reality under the depressing circumstances for ameliorative endeavor lately prevailing, especially in Central Europe. Once more, as when Antiochus Epiphanes invaded Judah and again under the Roman persecutions, a special and temporary situation has been audaciously generalized in theory, and an eschatology neurotically excessive has been embraced to offset it. Shall we also, under pressure of these difficult times, yield to cosmic boredom and gloom, and

renounce all faith in man, while still clinging to faith in a perverted inhuman idea of God?

Both an explanation of this sharp trend and an answer to the query it raises in our minds seem to be inadvertently hinted by one of the designations of the peculiar dogma in question; namely, the dialectical theology. I confess that the adjective "dialectical" often annoys me, because it is used by people who obviously do not know exactly what they mean by it. It sounds well, like "that blessed word Mesopotamia." But what it actually appears to mean in this connection is "paradoxical."

Now there is indeed paradox running all through the Christian religion. For paradox runs through all life. And the Christian religion is both alive and true. We have already commented on one practical paradox—the anti-theistic duties of the Church and of churchmen with regard to controversial social action. But the deepest paradox of the faith lies between the Incarnation on the one hand, and the Atonement on the other. The Incarnation declares God's kinship and self-identification with humanity. The Atonement declares the helplessness of humanity save for God's redemptive intervention from outside, as it were, through the potent sacrifice of His Son. The logical contradiction is manifest. But it conceals a vital harmony. Both Incarnation and Atonement are true, with all they stand for, as truth is measured in religion by the deepest experience under Christ's control. Both must be felt as well as verbally professed, if our faith is to be entire.

I have had something to say in criticism of the shallow societal idealism which I have labeled reformism. Reformism is the practical analogue of that surprising vagary of left-wing American liberalism, which, with delightful indifference to long-established connotations, has appropriated to itself the name of humanism—so old and venerable in a cultural association. Humanism in this novel sense believes so exclusively in the Incarnation that it recognizes no God save the aspiring spirit in man. And reformism feels the need of no aid beyond man's head and arm for building the kingdom of God on earth.

A reaction from this romantic man-worship is certainly in order. The crisis theology represents such a reaction; but, alas, to an equal and opposite extreme of romanticism. God is all, and man is nothing. Faith consists in admitting that we are nothing, and God is all. If we admit that we are nothing, God will make something of us. But God will do it all; action is the last thing He expects or wants from us. It is therefore both embarrass-

ing to Him and blasphemous. Thinkers of this school pay lip homage to the Incarnation; but they feel only the Atonement. That was amusingly illustrated at Madras. Evidently as a concession to them—for they were vociferous and aggressive among us—the climactic hymn at the great Christmas morning service was not “Joy to the World! The Lord is come!” but “When I survey the wondrous cross.”

Now a truly dialectical theology will rescue human action from obloquy while doing justice to indispensable divine grace by embracing triumphantly, in a firmly realistic mood, whether it can logically reconcile them or not, both terms of this prime paradox, Incarnation and Atonement. Men apart from God can do nothing; granted. But in all right efforts men may be sure that they are not apart from Him; He is with them, and works in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure. Christian action, all by itself, will not bring the kingdom of God into realization on earth. But to presume or propose to take action all by ourselves is not Christian. We are to witness, but also to work. We are to work, but also to trust while we serve. Without God, we could do nothing; but without us, God will do nothing in this realm where He has established man as His vicegerent. If we fail to do our part, we can hold back His Kingdom indefinitely.

I beg you to understand that this theological excursus has not been a digression. We can do nothing unless we believe in what we are doing. If we were to sell out our social hopes tomorrow to the despair of the crisis theology, we should be removing one of the chief bulwarks of freedom in our land. Day after tomorrow we too should doubtless be knuckling under to some form of godless dictatorship, in an acquiescence no less cowardly for having been rationalized. For tyranny is in the air today; and it can happen here. We cannot engage sanely in Christian social action, much less inspire or direct it in others, unless we know where we stand in theology, and tell our people about it too.

It is nonsense to say that laymen are no longer interested in theology, provided it is explained interestingly; that is, in words and with illustrations which the man in the pew will understand because they are borrowed from general usage instead of belonging to the formidable technical idiom of the seminaries. We shall not have the kind and amount of Christian social action for which our chaotic time is clamoring until Christians in general are taught to appreciate intellectually the religion from which such action proceeds as a rational and natural expression of its spirit. That means more theolog-

ical preaching, not less. If we do it skillfully, our people can be counted on to welcome it. For our people like to think just as much as their fathers did.

The balanced acceptance in our thinking and feeling of both Incarnation and Atonement, because both independently are true to experience and therefore they must harmonize, though on a glancing appraisal they seem to be in conflict, is an illustration of what I understand liberalism to be. The English call it "realism," by the way; and there is much to be said for this synonym. Liberalism or realism is not any set of opinions. It is a frame and orientation of mind. It consists in candid confrontation of all available truths, and in balanced assessment of them. Men of the most divergent opinions on matters lying beyond direct demonstration can be equally liberal, provided they are equally honest and try equally hard to appraise all their findings justly. Liberalism is that frame of mind which is presupposed for the practice of democracy. And that brings us to the next and final phase of our topic-text, namely, "Christian citizenship."

A citizen is a member of a self-governing political unit. The state was originally a city. Athens and Rome, for instance, were city-states before they won empire. The word "citizen" is worthy of special remark because it corresponds with "bourgeois." The bourgeois is literally a member of that self-governing political unit which was called in medieval France a *bourg*—in England, a borough—in Italy, a commune. A city was a borough to which certain additional privileges had been conceded. Cities and boroughs or communes were islands of freedom and equable law maintained precariously by merchant aggregations diked within town walls against the surging sea of feudal anarchy. The bourgeois was about the only civilized European for a thousand years, and the only man with a developed brain through a long age of harebrained clubswinging. Democracy is by no means discredited by the fact that its normal trend is to level the rich down and the poor up to the substantial middle plane of personal liberty and material sufficiency, intelligence and skilled initiative which has historically been occupied by the bourgeois, in the proper sense of that abused term.

When we speak of Christian citizenship, we imply a profession of religious faith in democracy. And democracy is a general principle of the gospel which belongs in that realm of social action lying behind partisan controversy, and rightly within the purview therefore of the Church. But to describe democracy as a principle, and moreover a principle of the gospel, is a way of speaking which requires explanation.

Democracy does not mean a party—the Democratic or any other. It does not mean a political system—the American Constitution or any other. These may be instruments of democracy; but democracy itself is no scheme or device. It is a way of living, applicable to all relations social, economic and political. It proceeds from deference for the essential nature of man, as that nature is defined through factual observation and illustrated in the example and teachings of Jesus Christ.

And here we encounter another paradox: man as both creature and creator of society. On the one hand, man is demonstrably the creature of his environment; and especially, as this particular man, of the particular society which has produced him. His body and his temperament, or cast of mind, are derived from his parents. His nurture, his ingrained habits, and his education, are derived from the community in which he lives. He is aware of others before he is aware of himself. Indeed, he can never sustain awareness of himself except in some sort of relation with others involving some sort of dependence upon them. To his dying day, no matter how vigorously he may revolt, he will go on belonging to the sex, the family, and the historic period in which he was born without his prior consent; and to some community, if only as a deserter and a renegade. Our debts and our commensurate duties to society are literally inescapable. And ultimately, though shading off into gradations so vague that we can all too easily overlook them, the society to which we belong includes all mankind, past, present and future.

But on the other hand, though the creature of his environment, man is also in turn one of its creators. All that he does will have effects beyond himself. And much that he does cannot be accounted for without remainder, in terms of causation direct or indirect from beyond himself. He is a center of spontaneous, original, incalculable action. There may be no place in logic for this freedom of man's will. But there is no place in life for any consistent denial of it. Even to argue against my own freedom is for me inadvertently to acknowledge it. For in doing so I have to proceed upon the assumption that I am free to argue, and you are free to be convinced. The area of our freedom within a field of actions determined by forces external to ourselves may be small, but it is capable of enlargement through effort. The greater the degree of inner freedom which a man achieves for himself, the more harm or good he can do to others.

Every man is entitled to all the freedom he can use. Yet, by the fact of his dependence as a creature and inextricably a member of society, he is

placed under a moral obligation to use his freedom for the general good. Social progress in the last analysis hangs not upon institutional regulation of living conditions, however favorable, but upon the development and generous employment of individual capacities and talents, of which genius is our word for the highest grade. The sound ordering of society is secured when every member of the body politic is, in the first place, recognized as a citizen, not as a subject only; and is, in the second place, both a leader qualified by expertness in his own specialty, and a follower of leaders similarly qualified in other lines.

Now democracy as a way of life consists simply in living out the consequences of recognizing every man in his dual capacity, as a creature and also as a creator, and by his very originality a potential benefactor, of society. Collectivism sees man only as creature. Fascism is that form of collectivism which makes the one practical exception, that to a supreme Leader, and to him only, is conceded creative power; it corresponds in politics with the crisis theology. Communism is that form of collectivism which makes the one theoretical exception, that the total group can create, whereas its components are but creatures; it corresponds in politics with religious humanism. Between the two, freely confronting the facts and balanced in its appreciation of them, stands democracy. Democracy honors every man as a creator, while simultaneously it presses home upon every man his obligations of gratitude and service to the collectivity which has produced and thus as God's agent created him.

The point needs no laboring, I take it, that this fruitful paradox runs all through the New Testament, and is requisite to a truly Christian doctrine of man. Reduced to its essence—disencumbered of fantastic excrescences tacked on by the fanatic fringe among its adherents—the democratic movement of the last one hundred fifty years in world society is then a belated overtaking of Jesus in His implicit philosophy of social intercourse. It is no accident of our double allegiance to the Cross and to the American flag that we identify democracy as a principle of the gospel, though we must rigorously refuse to identify the gospel with any specific experimental project for the practical working out of democratic details. Whatever her abstract theories, moreover, the Church in all lands cannot help standing in actual behavior and influence for what democracy means, in so far as under her often misleading creeds she conserves a loving docility toward her Lord in matters affecting conduct. And in our free land, especially at this time when

theories both political and religious are being fashioned or revived with an opposite trend, it should be clear that we have no charge more conscriptive than to clarify this democratic Christian principle in our own minds and for our people, and to insist upon its practice at all levels and in all connections within our commonwealth, as against every attempt at infringement of so salient and necessary a truth.

First, then, in guiding our fellow Christians toward a proper concern effectually expressed for social righteousness, we must remind them of their creaturely status, not only before God, but in subordination to the community. The valid aim of life is not self-realization, but the welfare of the brethren. No man lives unto himself, nor should any man seek to do so. There are three correlates of this truth.

The first of these correlates of social creaturehood is patriotism. It is a word vilely degraded since the emergence of competitive nationalism some four centuries ago as a precarious social pattern for the world, superseding the hypothetical solidarity of medieval Europe under one Church and one Empire. It has been debased to stand for virtual worship of the State as an instrument of commercial or territorial aggrandizement. But the State is only one element in the nation—namely, that provision which it makes for maintaining order within and security against external foes. And patriotism rightly means love of the nation as a whole, like a man's love of his home, which normally makes him more rather than less regardful of a like domestic attachment in his neighbors. The nation consists of the country itself, and all the people who regularly occupy it, and their folkways—that is, the characteristic ways they have evolved or ordained of living together—including the State, but as no more than a subsidiary item. The man who realizes that he does not and cannot stand alone, but is part and parcel of his nation, with all his roots in its soil, will love his country and his people and their characteristic ways as he loves his mother and his father, his brothers and his sisters, his wife and his children, the houses they dwell in and their family customs. He will never be ashamed of his origin. He will not hold himself aloof. He will feel with and for his kind, in a deep sweet loyalty of the heart.

The second correlate is patience. The trouble with what I have called reformism is that it lives in today for the sake of tomorrow, with hardly a recollection of yesterday, no retrospect of the long past, and no outlook on the far future. But we are severally links in a chain of earthly being which

runs as far back as our first human ancestor, if not even more deeply into organic backgrounds, and which shall run as far forward as any descendants of ours or of any whose lives we have helped to mold shall survive anywhere on earth. Whatever has been won thus far for the right and the true in human norms and institutions has been won, not in a hurry, but slowly, through time beyond our reckoning. So it is reasonable to anticipate that whatever further changes for the better may be wrought, they will accrue also over periods far longer than our brief lives and what we think we can foresee. We are not to abate our endeavors; for, though they should count but little, nevertheless we want them to count in the right direction. Nevertheless, we shall not surrender to discouragement and cry failure because we cannot see the work of our hands in realization of our generous dreams established in our time. We are severally but units in a grand succession of little men striving one after another in turn to bring God's will to pass. As members of a community which is in His care, with ages available to our race and to Him for perfecting the accomplishments which His Spirit bids us men undertake and pursue, we can afford to be patient. "Be ye therefore steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord," and in the long run.

The third of these correlates of our creaturehood in society is emotional identification of ourselves with the worst as well as the best in our community. I mean that as a paraphrase of the vicarious principle which has received such supreme statement in the elegies of the Second Isaiah upon the Suffering Servant of the Lord that our Saviour saw in those songs a prefiguring of His own passion as he took upon Himself the sins of many. No man is able to meet any need adequately, in Christ's spirit, unless he approaches that need with sympathy, as if it were his own. Lord and Lady Bountiful, superciliously handing down doles, succeed only in making fools of themselves and paupers of their beneficiaries. No man is qualified for Christian social action under any banner or auspices unless he feels the sins and woes of his people as if he himself had committed all these sins and were bowed beneath all these woes. Are there people starving in America, and lives festering in slums and brothels? Is there heartless greed or shameless corruption or bloodthirsty militarism in America? It is not they who are responsible; it is all of us. It is we. It is I. Unless I feel that, and address myself to these problems not on paper but in life—to these wrongs which bite and sting the social body—from within that body, as a full partner in its faults

and griefs as well as in its hopes and opportunities, I can do nothing to remedy or alleviate them.

Then in turn, over against our creaturehood, we must remind ourselves and our fellow Christians of our creative capacities also. We are not to lie down under the afflictions of our land, material or moral; we are to rise up and help lift them. For each of us has it in him to make and to do; and, before making or doing, to plan with unique foresight along lines of original strategy.

This is another paradox, if you please. I am one with my people all the way; but also I am apart from my people. And I never assert my apartness more cogently than in realizing emotionally my submergence in the mass. I am both actor and onlooker in the drama of mankind. As onlooker or critic, I can reshape the action of this oddly indeterminate and spontaneous spectacle toward a better finale if I will. I am bound by the conventions of my group; but only so far as they do not conflict with my convictions as a man. I am never more wholly one with my group than when for my brethren's sake I defy their opinions and break with their usage in order to stand out and stand up for a point of right which will promote their emancipation in some particular from the lower for the higher life, and thereby minister in the end to their wellbeing through correction of their practices and raising of their standards.

It is indeed only from the vantagepoint of this radical independence in waiting upon none but the God of righteousness with ready ear and prompt obedience, that any man can appreciate his creaturely status in those terms of patriotism, patience, and vicarious suffering which we have canvassed. Failing the intimate and impelling conviction that, however he came to be, he is at heart himself and at last answerable only to God, a man will be but a supine creature, with that sullenness in submission which corrodes and at length vitiates the virility of the masses under every autocracy.

That a Christian shall have the love to see himself as one with his people, and the courage to be one apart from his people when necessary in their behalf, alone with God for the right—that is the cardinal social principle of the gospel. It must be the mainspring of any social action which is to bring God's kingdom nearer to earthly manifestation. And it is also the principle of democracy, in contrast with any and all types of collectivism, which would turn men from names into numbers for the impersonal improvement of the dehumanized community. If we in the leadership of the churches can make

this principle evident and attractive to the Christians of America, as the starting point of their social aspirations, we shall be doing vastly more than if we were to carry into legislation by a marshaling of churchmen's votes even the most carefully devised and most foolproof schedule of immediate reforms ever proposed in the public interest. And we can do so, provided we will take with utmost gravity the educational aspect of the Church in all its services both of worship and of action, as designed to draw men forth into the fulness of available knowledge, personal poise, and manly prowess, so that with and through them God may work to perform in His good time His will of lovingkindness, not for America only, but for all the nations and races of His children under the stars.

God's kingdom will come. It will come through men, though not by them. It will come in spite of us, if we resist God; in default of us, if we are idle instead of eager in His cause. For sooner or later, He will find others for His purpose if we fail Him; and His purpose stands fast, that the earth shall one day be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. But we can do our part, too, if we will, and earn our little share in His great victory with which the skies shall yet resound. To that end we must respond by the light of our best judgment to His call for action, confident in His help whereby through all conscientious efforts, even though they happen to be in fact through our shortsightedness crossgrained to the truth, His aim is eventually advanced. We must remember humbly that we are creatures fashioned by and rooted in society, along with all our fellows. We must at the same time be proud to exercise our creative capabilities at God's behest, as centers of original and spontaneous action for the common weal.

Amsterdam on the Church and Race Relations

BENJAMIN E. MAYS

IT IS necessary to write further on the Amsterdam Conference because many people believe that one of the greatest problems confronting the Christian religion and the Church today is the problem of race. They believe that until the Church solves the problem of race within its own fellowship it will be impotent to proclaim the gospel of Christ in other areas.

The Amsterdam Conference has special bearing on the Church and race relations because in some respects it set an example for the churches of the world to follow. It demonstrated within its own confines the reality of the Christian community, thus showing how beautiful and satisfying an experience brotherly love is and can be. Many of the young people assembled there came from sections of the world where fellowship across racial lines, even in God's Church, is definitely forbidden. Whatever may have happened or does happen in various local communities, there was no color bar at Amsterdam. Members of many races from seventy-two countries mingled freely and happily together. It was a joy to sit with the United States delegation on the rostrum the opening night in the great concert hall and view that audience of fifteen hundred or more delegates with various races represented in their national delegations. More moving still was the Communion Service held on Sunday morning, July 29, when approximately one thousand Christians communed together. Sitting at a point of vantage, one could see how thoroughly mixed the audience was: a Japanese here, a Chinese there, a Filipino yonder, an Indian across to your right, a Bantu directly in front of you, a European white to the left of you, a Canadian or an American white sitting behind you, a Negro from the United States sitting nearest the pulpit—all these people were scattered indiscriminately in the Dutch Reformed Communion Service in the Nieuwe Kerk, on the Dam. One hundred at a time they assembled to commune, until approximately the one thousand persons had partaken of the Lord's Supper. The same racial mixture obtained at the Communion table, a beautiful sight to behold; despite the unfortunate circumstance that made it necessary to hold four such services. Momen-

tarily, at least, people if steeped in race prejudices apparently forgot them. For the most part, it made no difference who one's seat-mate chanced to be. Whether seated in the church, in discussion groups, or at the dinner table with members of different races, the friendship appeared real and the interracial fellowship wholesome. One heard of a few exceptions here and there but not enough to make a marked difference or to mar the total picture.

Amsterdam not only demonstrated what Christian fellowship is and can be, but it showed how that fellowship should be expressed in the leadership of the Church. As difficult as it is for Christian fellowship to obtain in many churches, it is still more difficult for some church people to tolerate the leadership of members of minority races, especially if that leadership is of African origin. This made no difference at Amsterdam. Probably never before in a World Christian Conference has Negro and African leadership been so pronounced. Members of the African and Negro races were at the very heart of the conference program, serving as experts, co-ordinators, discussion group chairmen, worship leaders, and conference chairmen. It was equally true in the case of delegates from the East. Representatives from China, India, Ceylon, and other Eastern countries made able and acceptable leaders.

Amsterdam had further significance for the Church in that the vast majority of the young people assembled there were having their first great experience of what is meant when we speak of the Church—a church reaching beyond race and nation. They were having their first ecumenical experience. It is impossible for a young man or woman who has been trained in the narrow confines of race and denomination to understand the meaning of the Church universal without having had an experience similar to that of Amsterdam. A few had read of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences, but they were not real to them. They went to Amsterdam thinking of churches or denominations. They left thinking in terms of the Church.

So far, we have presented only one side of the picture in the treatment of the topic, "The Bearing of Amsterdam on the Church and Race Relations." From this point on, we will speak of its bearing on the Church and Race more realistically and critically.

If one viewed the question of race only on the basis of the fine Christian fellowship experienced at Amsterdam, he would feel that the kingdom of God had come in that area. But to understand fully the bearing of Amsterdam on the Church and Race, one needs to probe deeply and to point out the

various issues that came to the front in the Commission on Race. Since this article deals in the main with the attitudes expressed in that Commission, the various problems reflected within the experience of the group itself should be indicated. They varied in type and seriousness and covered most of the complicated race problems of modern times. There was the so-called "color problem" as seen in countries where there is a minority group descended from liberated slaves, as in the United States; as seen in colonies or dominions where there is a minority white population—for example, Africa and India; as seen in countries where there is the added complication of a group of people of mixed blood—"Colored" south Africans and Anglo-Indians of India; or as seen in colonies or dominions where there is a minority native colored population, as is found in Australia and New Zealand. There was the Jewish problem, where there is a large population of Jews and where active persecution obtains; where there is a Jewish problem of any size and prejudice is being created; where Jewish immigration is being allowed and there is fear of prejudice being developed; and as seen where there has been Jewish immigration and resultant unrest. Time did not permit the groups to study in detail all these problems; so by deliberate choice, most of the time was spent on the Jew, the Bantu, and the Negro.

The Jewish question challenged the Christian Church at two vital points: (1) Can Christian people be so converted, changed in heart and mind that they will be Christian in their treatment of and in their attitude toward the Jews? (2) Has the Christian Church a gospel for the Jews?

As one sat in the Commission on Race, viewing the difficult role of the Jew in history to which "Christians" have contributed and listening to the challenge put to the young Amsterdam Christians by Conrad Hoffman, it is not at all clear that the Christian Church will meet its responsibility in this area. The story was told of the deep-seated prejudice against sixteen million Jews, half of whom are under the cloud of persecution, being hounded and driven out of their native lands; and of how Christian churches are shirking their responsibility in coming to the rescue of these refugees. It was revealed that even the Christian Church itself had taken part in the persecution of the Jews by burning them as heretics and forcing them to become Christians. Story after story was told showing that anti-Semitic prejudices are increasing the world round. Our minds were refreshed on the fact that Christian England, France, Spain, and Russia are all guilty of having driven the Jews out at one time or the other. Some Europeans could and did sit in

the Commission on Race and condemn what white America does to Negroes and what white South Africa does to the Bantu, but they could and did justify what Germany and Poland are doing to the Jews. It was clearly shown that this prejudice against the Jew exists in all the great Christian bodies: Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Greek Orthodox. Christians in the Commission, many of them, could explain in detail why the Jews were mistreated, with a tendency to feel that to understand the reason for the prejudice is enough to justify it. A member of the Commission on Race, a fine Christian person it seems, and apparently without prejudice, came across the Channel from Amsterdam by way of the Hook of Holland. There were a few Jews on the boat. Speaking of these Jews at a luncheon in London, this person complained of the noise they made on the boat, commenting that it is quite understandable why people feel as they do toward Jews. One wonders if the feeling would have been the same if the noise had been made by non-Jewish Englishmen. When a European in the Commission, struck with horror over the plight of the Negro in southern United States, was reminded that the situation in some sections of Europe with respect to the Jew is no better, he protested, and insisted promptly that the Jewish problem is entirely different. When a Christian can become righteously indignant over a situation three thousand miles away and can defend an equally horrible one at his door, the Church has a hard job on hand. It was clearly seen in some instances that many young Christians condone the injustices that are being perpetrated upon the Jews in various parts of the world. Amsterdam reveals again the fact that Christian people need to be born again, re-Christianized. If Christianity has the power to recreate men, to change them to such an extent that they are really new creatures in Christ Jesus, then it is clear, from the attitudes Christian people hold toward the Jews, that the Church has not done a good job in converting most of us. "The relation of evangelism to the race problem was seen therefore in the fact that a converted man should be thoroughly changed and those holding views creating racial problems would naturally abandon them on conversion." Some members of the group "urged that evangelism should not be mere talk but that it should be accompanied by positive action." And this raises the other question referred to above.

Has the Christian Church a gospel for the Jew? There is a strong feeling among a good many Christians that the Jew should be evangelized. As one member expressed it at Amsterdam, the Church should really attempt to evangelize the Jew and not be satisfied with nominal conversion. But

this view places a tremendous responsibility upon the Church. One may say considerable about Christianizing the Jews, but unless Christian people can become Christian enough to abolish their prejudices against the Jew, it is legitimate to challenge the Church's right to try to evangelize the Jew. Then if the Church has no gospel for the Jew, has it a gospel for the Moslem or the Hindu in India or the Moslem or "heathen" in Africa? Conrad Hoffman spared no pains in driving this point home to the members of the Commission on Race. Amsterdam challenges the Church, therefore to demonstrate within Christianity itself that it can be Christian in its attitude toward and in its treatment of the Jews. If the Church seeks to evangelize the Jews without first cleansing its own soul, it will not only be less effective than it would otherwise be, but it will tend to prove that we are more interested in the Jew's soul and his welfare after death than we are in his security and welfare in this life. The Church is therefore challenged to demonstrate by the fruits of its own members that Christians are better than those they seek to save.

Amsterdam raised the question once again as to how far the Church should go in discussing openly and frankly difficult problems and how far it should go in taking sides and in condemning wrongs which to many people are obviously incompatible with Christian principles and ideals. Should the argument be advanced that Christians must be kind toward others in their discussions and that they should not go out for the express purpose of cracking heads, the reasonable mind would agree. But when Christian people must move so cautiously that certain outstanding evils cannot even be discussed, to say nothing of passing resolutions to condemn them, it is high time that we examine ourselves and see if the faith of our fathers is living still and if the courage that characterized some of the early Christians and the Prophets is not slipping away from us. We had to respect the wishes of our host, the Dutch Government; so the delegates were warned more than once to say nothing against Germany that might embarrass the host. Frankly, it is the opinion of the writer that we leaned over backward at that point. The Amsterdam Conference was not a free conference, for at all times one had to be on his guard lest he say the wrong thing, particularly if certain countries were mentioned. Perhaps this is the price that must be paid for world fellowship and for ecumenism if we ever completely achieve it.

The Amsterdam Conference has special bearing on the Church and Race Relations in that it revealed clearly the fact that the Church has yet to decide what it will do relative to segregated churches which deny fellowship

across racial lines. The Amsterdam experience demonstrated once more that the Christians are deeply divided on this question. The question there shaped itself in some such fashion as this: Can a Church be a Christian Church, a true representative of Jesus Christ, heir of the tradition of the early Church, expounder of Christ's gospel and at the same time deny fellowship across racial lines in "its services of worship, in its organization, in its Christian home, and in its more informal fellowship?" Representatives of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa took the position that segregated churches are not unchristian and that they are not incompatible with what Jesus taught and did. They argued that it is the will of God that Dutch and Bantu have separate churches. The Bantu representatives took issue with the position advanced by the Dutch. Though accepting the situation in South Africa as inevitable at the moment, they do not believe that it is the will of God. They believe that it is the will of the Dutch who, occupying a point of vantage, are able to impose their strong wills upon the less privileged Bantu. The Bantu believe that the faith of the Bantu people is being severely strained when they see that the Church is no better on the point of discrimination than the government itself. A representative from the West Coast advanced the argument that in his area Africans were turning to atheism owing to the fact that Christianity is doing little or nothing to solve the race problem. The view was also expressed that it is at the point where fellowship is denied in the Christian Church that Negroes in the United States are most critical of the Church. It is expected by them that the Church will go further in its fellowship than secular organizations such as hotels, theaters, restaurants, dance halls, and barber shops. To sit in a world conference and find a strong minority not only justifying segregated churches on the ground that it is the will of God, but using Scripture to prove the point, is quite disturbing and it shows that church people still quote those passages of Scripture that seem to prove their point of view, leaving unquoted those passages that condemn what they do or want to do; either that, or they place the interpretation on the passages that more nearly support what they want supported. It had to be pointed out, more than once, to an articulate minority that passages in the Old Testament, such as in Ezra where foreign wives were put away, and in the New Testament account of the Jerusalem Council where circumcision was demanded, represent religious exclusions rather than racial exclusions.

The Church must not deceive itself. The Christian who can justify

a denial of Christian fellowship across racial lines in God's Church can and will justify discrimination in other areas. He will condone and justify economic exploitation, political disfranchisement, and social proscription of every kind such as the Negro experiences in the United States and the Bantu in South Africa. It can hardly be otherwise. How can the Church raise its voice against these wrongs if it is guilty of similar practices within its own borders? Nor can the Church escape the indictment that to withhold fellowship from a brother on the basis of race is to deny his intrinsic worth as possessing a personality that is sacred unto God.

It should be said here that the supporters of this position were in the minority. There was another minority which sustained the belief that any system of religion that denies fellowship on the basis of race or color is wholly unchristian and that it is sheer folly to try to justify the practice on the basis of Christian principles. The Church should repent of its sins and move rapidly toward the ideal where "there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female" and do it at the risk of peril. The majority believed that the Church must reach beyond national or racial bonds, but that Christians must be realistic and accept the situation as it is, realizing that it takes time to change social attitudes. This point of view is a challenge to the Church. If this is the case, how different is the churchman's attitude from that of the sociologist? Can people be changed by the power of the gospel so that they become new creatures in Christ Jesus? The Christian Church has always made this claim. Is it true?

There was no mistaking the fact that the basic fear of an unrestricted Church interracially was the fear that Christian fellowship would lead to intermarriage. This fear was plainly expressed by a white South African. There was a failure to distinguish between normal fellowship experienced at Amsterdam and social contacts designed for, or social contacts that might lead to, intermarriage. To put the issue sharply, does Christian fellowship in the Church—worshiping together, without discrimination, singing, praying, meditating and working together in the Church, experiencing fellowship in Christian homes—do these activities lead to intermarriage? An impartial study of the facts would probably prove that such contacts do not lead to intermarriage. But if they do, what bearing would this have upon the Christian Church? Must the Church seek first and foremost to maintain segregated churches, though in doing so it sets the pace for and takes the lead in and gives divine sanction to deeper discriminations in civic, political, edu-

cational and economic areas, or should the Church seek first and foremost to maintain Christian fellowship across racial lines regardless of social consequences? This issue presents a challenge to the Church, especially in areas like the United States and South Africa where racial conditions seem to be most acute and somewhat alike.

Amsterdam has further significance for the Church and Race Relations. It is in the area where some people feel that the function of the Church is in the realm of the Spirit and that it has nothing to do with the social order. This issue came to the front in all the discussions having to do with race, and it underlies all the questions raised up to this point. Has the Church a relevant word for every area of life, or is it the primary function of the Church to preach and declare the Word? The position of the Church on this issue should be clear. If it is the primary function of the Church to preach and declare and prepare men for eternal salvation, the Church has nothing special to say of the Jewish situation except to evangelize the Jew. If this is the main function of the Church, the denial of fellowship in God's Church is a minor issue. The majority of the young churchmen assembled refused to accept this position. They contended that the Church has a relevant word for every area of life; hence it cannot escape its responsibility in seeking to create a world in which Jews would not be persecuted and in which, as members of God's family, they would be brothers in Christ not only in heaven above but in the earth beneath. The latter position goes beyond fellowship in the Church. It is concerned, therefore, with circumscriptions that manifest themselves in the area of civic, political, and economic life. This being true, the persecution of the Jews in Germany and Poland, the complete subjugation and exploitation of the Bantu in South Africa, the disfranchisement and economic proscriptions of Negroes in the United States, the treatment of the Aborigines in Australia, the Anglo-Indian problem in India, and the struggle of suppressed peoples everywhere—all these must be the immediate concern of God's Church. No distinction was made in the discussion between those who believe that man can do nothing to establish the kingdom of God on earth and those who believe that man is an instrument in God's hand and may co-operate with Him in building the kingdom of God.

Whatever view one may take of the function of the Church, Amsterdam raised the age-old question: "Is the Church to obey God or man, Jesus or governments? The question was sharply put: How far should the Church or the Christian go in accepting or breaking down the established customs,

mores, and practices of society? The Commission on Race at Amsterdam seemed to prove that the Church, and for the most part, the individual Christian, obeys man rather than God. When the question was raised in the two sections as to whether the Amsterdam experience of Christian fellowship could be reproduced at home, the answers given are revealing. About one-half of them said it could be reproduced. The other half said the Amsterdam experience could not be reproduced in their local communities, the reasons being: inherited prejudice, lack of understanding, differences in culture between racial groups, language differences, accepting blindly the established mores, clannishness, fear of intermarriage, selfishness, lack of courage to do what one believes to be the right thing, the desire to maintain the culture of the dominant group, fear that by mingling with other races one would lose social status and prestige, the fear of something new, and differences of culture. These are some of the reasons given as to why the Amsterdam experience could not be reproduced in their local communities. These replies seem to indicate the answer to the question: from whom does the Christian or the Church get authority? If the attitude of the youths participating in the Race Commission at Amsterdam is representative of the Church, it shows clearly that the Church has no clear notion as to what God's will is in the area of race, and that many of us are not in the least concerned about the will of God. We will follow the course and procedure that are socially acceptable and the course that points the way to economic security. Amsterdam furnishes further proof of the fact that on vital questions of today, the churches are confused and baffled.

Finally, Amsterdam suggests to the churches that it needs to do something to make its youth Biblically intelligent. For the most part, young people are amazingly ignorant of what the Bible has to say concerning the great issues of life. This was true not only of American delegates, but of delegates from other parts as well. The youths were not informed on what the Old and New Testaments have to say about race. Furthermore, many of the American youths not only did not know but they seemed to feel that it does not matter one way or the other what the Bible has to say about race. Many of these young people had high and noble ideals relative to race and wished to see justice prevail. But it seems clear that if Christian youths are to be pioneers in creating finer interracial fellowship and a more just economic order, they should be anchored in Christian principles. Their desire for social action should be motivated by something different from that

of communists. Here is a challenge to the churches of every denomination to do more than they are now doing to make their young people both Biblically and religiously intelligent. In all these areas Amsterdam has direct bearing upon the Church of Christ.

The question naturally arises: what bearing will Amsterdam have on interracial behavior in local situations where Christian fellowship across racial lines is definitely denied such as one finds in America, particularly in southern United States and in South Africa? It is comparatively easy to behave in a Christian manner in a world gathering where one is more likely to be condemned rather than commended if he displays anything other than Christian virtues. Here one must be realistic. The segregated church situation in areas where it obtains will move along much in the same old way. It could hardly be otherwise. But a few individuals who attended the Amsterdam Conference will never be the same. The girl from Mississippi begins to question for the first time the unchristian character of the religious behavior in her community. The Dutch from South Africa is made to re-think his position on the Bantu-white relations. A leaven has been planted that will help in time to abolish every act of discrimination in God's house. The fellowship was so real that it presented a challenge to the young Christians assembled. One young man writes: "God made man—and He has an equal interest in each individual. I, as a Christian, must treat every man, woman or child with equal courtesy and love, no matter whether black or white, Jew or Gentile, Christian or non-Christian. From reading the Bible I am satisfied that that was Christ's attitude toward the race problem, and it must be mine."

A girl from the deep South is worried because she feels she cannot duplicate Amsterdam at home. Yet she feels she must do something in order to prove worthy of the name Christian. A young southern leader, having his first real interracial experience, admitted that again and again at the Conference the old prejudice of race re-asserted itself and that he had to take himself in hand. He was honest in what he said, stating plainly that one cannot overcome the prejudice of a lifetime in eight days. The writer makes bold to assert that in this young man something new was stirring and soon he will be among that advance guard of Southerners who labor to achieve Christian fellowship across racial lines in the heart of the South and who strive to make the religion of Jesus a reality in every department of life.

Trends in Group Work as Related to the Churches

ABEL J. GREGG

GROUP WORK uses procedures by which individuals with common interests may band their efforts together to achieve purposes which are mutually advantageous for society and for themselves as individuals. The character of these procedures is being determined by the demands of pertinent research findings. Research in the area of the psychology of learning, character, adolescence, juvenile delinquency, causes of social change, have yielded both the formulae and the criteria which are testing the effectiveness of procedures of group life.

The purpose of this paper is to mention a few of the basic researches whose findings and formulae are directing some trends in group work procedure, to describe a few of these trends and to apply them to the work of the Church in character building. I am assuming this is a main purpose of the Church for the age group up to 16 years.

One of the most basic criteria of good group work is that learning is experience. Another is that the character by-products of experience depend upon the quality of the motive it embodies. These formulations, growing out of research in learning by Thorndike, showing that learning is experience and that the quality of the learning and therefore of character is determined by the satisfactions which motivate and control it, have received such vindication from succeeding researches that their importance for group work and character education is increasingly and more widely clear.

The Hartshorne and May studies are explicit in their substantiation of these laws at so many different points that I could not summarize them all here. I point out two or three, however, as outstanding samples:

In their Character Education Inquiry, they found that a child is most likely to act in accordance with standards and customs approved by his group. If he is shifted from one group to another whose standards he also knows and whose standards are opposed to these he experiences in the first group, he will act in the ways of the new group. Any attempts to find the relationship between this individual's knowledge and his conduct, apart from the influence

of these group situations, yielded nothing. The findings go on to say that many a boy has three vocabularies, one for the Sunday school, one for the dinner table, and one for the alley, and he never mixes them.

Learning here seems to be limited to the group in which the experience happens. There is little relationship between the knowledge that a boy has about the rightness of conduct and the use he makes of that knowledge in the groups in which he expresses himself. Morals and conduct seem to be a function of group standards. He may, therefore, have a home code, a school code, a Sunday-school code, a club code, etcetera.

The total research, therefore, bears out the fact that learning is specific. Its findings substantiate the law of transfer as the logical explanation of the correlation that exists between the individual's behavior in different situations. There seems to be transfer or identity of response, only to the extent to which potent factors in one situation are identical with potent factors in another. They go on to point out that "this does not preclude the operation of ideals and standards, but requires that such standards should be potent factors common to the situations in which conduct is taking place."

Similarly, in the research which Dimock has carried forward and reported in his *Rediscovering the Adolescent*, he points out that there is no biological or physiological cause for the gain in ability of a boy to make wise and good choices. Whether he increases in this ability or not, and whether he comes to the place where he makes a basic decision as to the direction in which his life shall go, is a function of the groups to which he belongs.

The Thrasher study of a boys' club in New York showed that behavior patterns were so entirely within the control of the group to which a boy belongs that the most careful measurements of the efforts of a boys' club over its first four years did not reveal any change in the behavior patterns of boys belonging to the group studied.

Here are several important researches carried on in different parts of the country with different selections of boys, all of which deny categorically many of the present assumptions upon which character education is now proceeding and which make demands on group work and character education of a most exacting nature.

These findings deny, for instance, the basic assumption underlying many of the character building efforts of such agencies as the Church, the Y. M. C. A., Boy Scouts, Boys' Clubs, settlement houses and others. So much so, that Hartshorne and May are inclined to say: "There is little evidence that

effectively organized moral education has been taking place," and again "Peculiarities of home, church, school, Sunday school, teacher, club leader, and everything else that deliberately attempts to influence the child, work upon him by diverse means and with diverse results. Anarchy in the leadership of moral education is not likely to produce order in the character of a child. At all events, such leadership as we have in typical American communities has not resulted in organized conduct."

The findings deny the assumption that it is possible to teach generalized virtues so that they carry over or transfer and affect the life of the individual as it expresses itself within various groups. They deny the assumption that the teaching of moral or ethical knowledge affects conduct apart from experience. They deny the assumption that it is possible to set up groupings of boys and girls apart from the main channels of experience of the life of the individual and carry on teachings in these artificial groupings which affect the life experiences going on daily in the main channels of experience. They raise very real questions about most of the groupings used by organizations now at work with children and young people.

These findings demand that character education shall be a function of and a procedure within the group relationships and channels of experience important to the life of the individual; that there shall be some way set up whereby the experiences in these main channels of the life of an individual may be integrated.

If the Christian churches' efforts and those of character building agencies are not productive in organized moral character, what are the mainsprings of character in American children? Several researches show agreement about the effectiveness of social groupings within the lives of boys. The Harts-horne and May Character Education Inquiry attempted to get measurements as to the effectiveness in character formation of major groups which make up the life of the child. They found that the parents' moral knowledge, as measured on a moral knowledge test, correlates highest with their children's ratings on such tests. That is, children resemble their parents with a correlation of .545 in moral knowledge, which is more than they resemble friends, club leaders, public school teachers, or Sunday-school teachers. Correlation between children and Sunday school teachers is the lowest, being .002. Between children and their friends is the second highest correlation, or .35; between children and club leaders, .137; between children and public school teachers, .06.

The research of Healy and Bronner, in the field of juvenile delinquency, also corroborates the basic importance of the parental relationship with children in their character guidance. Their findings showed that if a child made a satisfying adjustment with at least one parent in the home, so that his basic urges were satisfactorily met, he would overcome many of the basic social forces which caused even a twin brother, who did not make such satisfactory adjustment, to go into delinquent ways of achieving satisfaction for his urges.

The researches by Dimock on adolescents, and Pelletieri on friends, as to the influence of friends, corroborate the findings of the Hartshorne and May study, and point to the fact that next to the home the friendships formed in the neighborhood of the home, with propinquity being a very high factor, are important sets of forces which bear upon the life of the American child well up into his grade and junior high school experiences.

We need now to lay this finding as to the importance of the groups and group experiences, or the important channels of experience, alongside our first finding, to see what the implications of these two basic findings are for character education. Our first finding is that character education is a function of the group, that it is a function of each group in which a person expresses himself; that the amount of carry over from one group to another is negligible; that unless identical learning experiences happen within these groups there is little chance of people coming to acceptable integration of character.

Our second finding shows that the groups from which the largest number of experiences and the most dominant forces are wielded upon child life are first of all parents; second, neighborhood play groups; third, club leaders, with positive correlations of much lesser importance for school teachers and negligible correlation for Sunday-school teachers.

It is important to stress again the fact that these findings challenge the artificialities of the groupings now being used by character building organizations and the Christian Church in their efforts at character development. They point out that there are great channels of experience widening out in the life of the child, in which he has a chance for action and experience and out of which action and experience his character is being formed. The importance of these social groups is corroborated by several researches. It is necessary that those ideals which Christian agencies would like to have dominate the life of an individual as intrinsic potent factors be inherent within the experience in these social groups. These criteria demand that character building agencies of the Christian Church shall cease using the artificial groupings

and do everything they can to organize their groups within the main streams of the experience of the people whose character they would affect.

It is essential, at this point, to bring up another finding from the Harts-horne and May study. We have assumed generally that there is growth in character which runs along with the increase in chronological age of children. This assumption is not borne out by the findings of the study. Rather, it is shown that the level of character achieved by the age of nine was not materially raised even in a period of four and five years of additional chronological age. Here too correlation was found between what happens in the homes of these children and their growth of character. The fifty most dishonest children came from homes where there was parental discord, bad example and unorganized discipline.

This finding, when put with the others, showing the basic importance of the home in child character development and the dependence upon experience for learning, suggests that parent education and child guidance are to be achieved out of the same set of experiences. We will not be able to lift children much above the level of attainment of parents. Parent education, therefore, becomes increasingly important as one faces the findings of these basic studies. If a child is to grow in character, he must be associated in his main channels of experience with adults who are growing in character.

The implications of these several criteria of group work for the organization of church groups is quite pointed. It challenges most of the basic organizational units now used by the Church for religious education and character development. The artificiality of the Sunday-school grouping, its lack of recognition of friendship groupings, and its lack of contacts with the main channels of experience of children, to say nothing of the shortness of time at its command in the life of a child during the week, is sharply challenged. The assumption of the Church that the religious education and character development of boys and girls can be taken from parents and homes, or that something so significant can be done for children in an hour or two a week that they will go back into their homes different people, is also sharply challenged. Other constructive assumptions are proposed:

First, that the Church shall act as if it believed that parents could and would, with the proper organization and supervision, undertake the religious and character education of their children. The Church must find ways of bringing together parents in neighborhoods around the actual experiences of childhood to achieve both child guidance in these experiences and parent

education around them, so that the experiences of home and neighborhood at least may be integrated around one core of values. The Church must further help parents to make the demands of public schools and the social and economic forces in community life whereby the codes experienced in home and neighborhood and play groups shall also have a chance for interpretation and for becoming potent factors within the experiences of children and adults in all aspects of community life. Adults must be actively seeking in all adult groups the same motives they wish their children to experience and build into their characters, if they are to grow themselves and be capable of causing progressive growth in their children.

The Christian community faces a pioneering venture to establish character education and I believe religious education, upon the solid foundation which these criteria suggest. At every point where it is possible, experimental procedures must be encouraged and undertaken to help pioneer and demonstrate how this basic movement can be created within our society.

In my own agency, the Young Men's Christian Association, I know with what great difficulty long-established institutional assumptions will be undermined. If the Association is to live up to its claim that it is the right arm of the Church, it must, however, help to pioneer the ways whereby a unified Christian community can organize and educate and direct parents in the ways whereby their children's experiences will achieve for them desirable Christian character by-products and an integrated philosophy of life around a Christian viewpoint. To this end, at the present time, the Young Men's Christian Association is experimenting with several very important types of group work. We have a Father and Son club organized around fathers who have boys of similar age and wherever possible among boys who play together. In this club, the streams of experience of home and play group become the subject matter of club life. As a father, I have experimented with this for two years around my relationships with my own son and his neighborhood play group of eight other boys and their fathers and have found it capable of yielding both father education and boy guidance. Other Association points in eleven states are experimenting with the same idea.

In one hundred and seventy-five different Associations across the length and breadth of the United States is going forward very widely differentiated experimentation with neighborhood play groups as an organizational point for group work. In some centers not only child guidance but also parent education is being achieved by organizing the parents whose boys are in a

club into a study group to exchange experiences at the parental level and learn how to better supervise the channel of experience of boy play.

In some cities, churches, school buildings, indoor equipment alongside of outdoor playgrounds are being used as outposts where these neighborhood clubs can meet. In cities where the Church is acting as an outpost, it acts on a geographical basis entirely apart from its denominational affiliation during the week, and helps to supply sponsorship, leadership and supervision for the groups in its geographical territory.

These experiments point to a new type of assumption and a new set of relationships between Christian agencies of the community which have real promise for the working out of a better type of community co-operation around character building. The basic assumptions are that the persons to carry the responsibility are parents; that parent education must be as important an objective as child guidance; that the neighborhood experience of children is of such great importance that parents must be challenged to organize themselves around it and use that experience for their own further education; that institutions must be asked to surrender their own prerogatives in favor of strengthening the basic rights of parents in these matters and helping to educate them in their functions of character guidance and character integration.

While the practical application of these principles concerning integration have been going on within the neighborhood play groups and the father and son groups in the Y. M. C. A., Lincoln B. Hale and other educators and research experts have been measuring the success of character education statistically at Yale. They found that the students who are most successful in making the transition from school to college are those whose group experiences have yielded the greatest number of identical situations so that integrated character development could take place as the child moved from group to group. Such integration of character is achieved through the development of the following four habit patterns: A Purpose pattern; A Social pattern; A Decision pattern; A Sensitive pattern. Concerning the contribution of the churches and religious experiences, we quote from their conclusions, which appear in this study just recently released for publication:

"Homes, churches, and other agencies surrounding the school present to the individual a diversified experience. The equipment with which the boy faces the transition experience (from school to college) is the result of his participation in all of them. . . .

"Efforts toward co-operation in formulating fundamental purposes, developing programs, determining specific procedures and detailed events in the all-around life of students may do more for unifying and developing an adequate religious experience than any other one thing. This will not require common agreement in content of religious belief nor even in forms of religious expression. What our findings do seem to indicate as essential for the influence of religion to be vital and effective in the lives of these boys, is more constructive co-operation in the recognized task of a common quest for the best and truest way of living in our present era. . . .

"Closer understanding between school and home regarding social and moral conduct and ideals, more sympathetic understanding between the leaders of church schools and religious organizations and secondary school forces regarding religious and scientific interpretations of our universe and man's place in it, and more genuine loyalty to the common cause of the best for the welfare of youth are all essential to this increase of unity and integration which we are suggesting. Where there is friction between these social institutions, where there is strong competition for the time and energies of the students, and where the emphases and practices of these institutions often appear to the student to be operating at cross purposes, normal, wholesome, spiritual and religious development among our student youth will be seriously hampered."¹

All this means that in the areas of child character development, the denominational line may give way to recognition of the groupings and social forces that are important in the life of children; that religious education must be thought of not in terms of bringing children to the church building, but in terms of helping parents learn how to supervise, from the point of view of the demands of Christian principles, the experiences of their children within their homes, within the neighborhood play groups, within the basic social groups and in the public school, and out into all the major potent guiding social, economic, industrial, political groups within the community.

This represents a great new venture on the part of the Christian forces of the community, and demands of the Christian Church and allied agencies the same thing which its Founder demanded; namely, that to be effective each must be willing to lose its life.

¹ *From School to College, a Study of the Transition Experience*, conducted by Lincoln B. Hale and others. Yale University Press, 1939.

The Bible in Contemporary Literature

CHARLES S. BRADEN

ONE hears conflicting statements concerning the status of the Bible today. On the one hand is heard the sophisticated scorn of the Bible Belt, the tacit assumption that the Bible is passé. Even when it is pointed out that the Bible still stands out as the world's best seller, the answer is made that such sales are the result of highly subsidized, high-pressure sales forces rather than any real reflection of the popular desire to possess the Bible. Furthermore, it is alleged that even if people buy Bibles they do not read them; and that this is the real test of the vitality of the Bible or any book today.

Anyone who teaches courses in the Bible and who attempts to test the knowledge of his students, who come, in the main, from good religious homes, can cherish few illusions as to how much these students have read the Bible.

It occurred to me that since literature is a recognized mirror of contemporary life I might profitably seek in it some answer as to the continuing place of the Bible in our modern life. We are all well aware of the degree to which the Bible is woven into our major classical literature. This has been studied in great detail and in the case of some of our greater writers entire books are dedicated to this phase of their work.

I took down a volume on Shakespeare's knowledge of the Bible and discovered that he had alluded once or more to Biblical material from 29 out of the 39 Old Testament books, all the Old Testament Apocrypha and from 24 out of the 27 New Testament books. I noted that his allusions extended to 21 different chapters in Genesis, to 62 different Psalms and to 25 different chapters of Job; to 27 out of 28 chapters of Matthew; to 21 out of 24 chapters of Luke; to 11 chapters of John's Gospel—and to many different verses in some of these many chapters and books.

I looked into a book entitled *Biblical Allusions in Poe* and found that it took 40 pages just to list his quotations and allusions. It required 3 pages of 2 columns each to list the scriptural proper names that he used and a like amount of space to list the definitely Biblical and religious words which he employed.

One might go on to cite Milton, Browning, Tennyson and even Walt

Whitman, to say nothing of Carlyle, Ruskin, and others whose familiarity with the English Bible is too well known to be rehearsed here.

What of the writers of our own time? Do they know and use the Bible? How could I find out? I decided to approach the problem in two ways; first, through the contemporary periodical literature which is probably much more widely read than books and therefore likely to be more influential in keeping the Bible before the readers of this generation. Is the Bible being written about or are Biblical themes appearing in the magazines that are widely read today? I had thought when I began my study that I might be able to discover some upward or downward trend, but this is not easily gauged save within given periodicals, since the indices upon which one must depend have, from time to time, added new magazines and dropped others. Comparative total figures are not, therefore, to be relied upon.

It would be interesting to know whether in religious journals the Bible is holding its own, but even more significant for a general study would be the number of Biblical articles in the secular magazines. Accordingly, the magazines were separated into religious and secular groups. The fact of additions and subtractions of magazines indexed from year to year makes the relative figures of not too great significance. We shall have to study individual magazines for a test of trends. Please note that nothing is said concerning the contents of the articles—whether they be favorable or unfavorable—only the fact that articles about the Bible in some form or other appear. Here are some of the results. First, some summary figures:

In the *nonreligious* periodicals indexed in *Reader's Guide*, 1900-04, there appeared a total of 68 articles on the Bible in 21 magazines;

1905-09—	115	articles in	25	magazines;
1910-14—	102	" "	29	" ;
1915-18—	40	" "	19	" ;
1919-21—	24	" "	11	" ;
1922-24—	79	" "	21	" ;
1925-28—	78	" "	26	" ;
1929-32—	61	" "	23	" ;
1933-35—	27	" "	17	" ;
1935-38—	35	" "	22	" .

The sudden drop from 1910-14 to 1915-18 is in part due to the fact that some periodicals, not a great many, nonreligious, yet carrying Biblical articles, were transferred to the *International Guide* to periodical literature. But these were war years, and preoccupation with other concerns might have

accounted mainly for the drop. However, neither of these considerations would account for the changes from 1925 on. Note here a steady decline in the number of articles in secular magazines dealing with Biblical subjects 1925 to 1935, with however a rise in the number in the 1935-38 period, to 35 articles in 22 magazines.

Looking closely at the nonreligious journals some interesting facts appear. In the less popular, more sophisticated or thoughtful type of magazines, *Harpers*, *Atlantic*, *Century*, *North American Review*, and *Forum*, there appears to be no very evident trend. *Harpers* has published but 12 articles classified in the indices as Biblical since 1900. Seven of these were between 1900-14, only one from 1915-25, and four since 1929. *Atlantic* has published but ten articles since 1900, four of these before 1910, three between 1922 and 1928, and three since 1932. *North American Review* published 15 between 1900 and 1939, five of these in the 1900-14 period, five from 1915 to 1925, and five between 1929 and 1932. Since then none has appeared. *Forum* has not very frequently discussed Biblical material, only six times in 38 years, and but twice since 1929.

Regarding the more popular type of magazine one gets the distinct impression that with but one or two exceptions the number of articles on the Bible has definitely declined. *Outlook* showed a decided downward trend. Of course, it was originally a religious journal and changed its character greatly in the later years of its existence. Here is its record in the successive periods: 28, 20, 22, 6, 3, 0, 3 and 0. *The Living Age*, which is still being issued, published 16 articles classified as Biblical in 1900-04, 11 in 1905-09, 14 in 1910-14, 1 in 1915-18, 3 in 1922-24, and none at all since that time. *Contemporary Review* published 8, 17, 6, 2, 4, 2, 1, in the successive periods from 1904 to 1928, then skipped to 1935-38 when three more appeared. The record of the *Literary Digest* is quite irregular. It appears in the index list first (for our purpose) in 1900-14 with 14 articles, 1915-18 with 9, 1919-21 with 4, 1922-24 with 13, 1925-28 with 9; in 1929-32 the number rises again to 13 but drops down to eight in 1932-35, and but four have appeared since 1935. The magazine is no longer published. What conclusions may be drawn from this I do not know; I only report the facts.

The *Ladies' Home Journal* has had a varied policy, apparently. It appears in the 1905-09 index volume with 12 articles; in the 1910-14 with six; skips entirely 1915-18; comes back in 1919-21 with two; jumps to 20 in 1922-24, to 24 in 1925-28, and has published none since. Again I have

no explanation to offer. *Current Opinion* from 1910 to 1928 published 17 articles classified as Biblical, but none before or since. *Collier's* broke in with 12 articles in 1925-28, one in 1929-32, and none before or since. Since 1925 the *Saturday Review of Literature* has published seven articles. I find in the popular *Saturday Evening Post* only two articles indexed in 1919-21 and three in 1925-28.

Thus it appears that in the most widely circulated magazine of all very little that is directly Biblical in subject finds a place. Given the general nature of the *Post*, largely story, that may not seem surprising. Yet the *Post* is sometimes taken as a fair reflection of the literary taste and interest of the great middle-class American public. Since there are not a few articles as well as stories in it, is it not a little strange and perhaps significant that so little that is frankly Biblical finds a place in so widely circulated a medium?

Unfortunately, very few popular religious journals are indexed, so the relative emphasis on the Bible in the religious press cannot be easily estimated. There is no way of discovering save by consulting the indices of the periodicals themselves, and few of these are indexed by subject matter in a way to make a fair comparison with the statistics drawn from the standard periodical indices. In these, one has at least a uniform plan of indexing which makes it possible to compare one year's output with another.

Next, let us look at books. Here the guide and source is the *Book Review Digest* which does not include all the books published, but only those that are reviewed in the magazines which are indexed. This list of magazines is not constant, however, and therefore the figures can be of only rough interest. What are the statistics here?

The total number of books in the Biblical field seems to be rising. The average per year for the five-year period from 1931 to 1936 is three times what it was in 1921, the last year recorded separately by years. 1921 seems to have been the low year since 1912, when the digest began. And 1937 shows a gain over this average. The number of books dealing with the New Testament shows a more marked increase than those regarding the Old Testament.

With so large a number of books appearing each year it becomes impossible to examine even a small percentage as to the apparent influence of the Bible upon them. One must use some sort of a selective process. Since in religious books one might reasonably expect to find a good deal of Biblical reference, though this might show a tendency to decrease or increase,

it was decided to pass them by for the present. Among the nonreligious books, fiction is, of course, most widely read. The determination of Biblical influence here would, perhaps, be more significant. But poetry and the drama would also be highly significant. So far my study has reached only into fiction.

A first and perhaps most obvious place to look for Biblical influence in the world of fiction would be in the titles books bear. Recalling a few recent titles that had some sort of a Biblical reference, like Aldous Huxley's *Eyeless in Gaza*, I examined the titles of such works of fiction as were listed in the *Book Review Digest* over a period of years with some very interesting results.

I picked up at random the 1917 volume and found that 14 of the books there reviewed bore what seemed to me to be Biblically based titles, though some of them may not have come consciously from the Bible, and for one or two I can find no sure warrant for regarding them as Biblical. But they sound Biblical to me. On the other hand, I am quite sure that I may have passed over others that were definitely Biblical because I did not happen to be familiar enough with all parts of Scripture.

In the cumulative index for the years 1927-31 I found 80 such titles—an average of sixteen per year; and in the years 1932-36 there were 113, a very few of these doubtful—an average of 22 per year. During 1937 there appeared 15 such titles. A few general observations concerning them may not be without interest. Analyzing them it appears that slightly more than half came from the Old Testament, 120 out of 225. The most frequently repeated reference is that to Eden. There are *Happier Eden*, *Storm Over Eden*, *Eden for One*, *Sinister Eden*, *In Sight of Eden*, *East of Eden*, *It Began in Eden* and *Outside Eden*, eight in all.

Thirty, or one-fourth of the Old Testament allusions are to the book of Genesis, the greater number of these having to do with the creation story. Twenty names of Biblical persons appear in these titles: Joseph, Adam, Eve, Luke, and Cain each three times; Magdalene and Delilah, Mary and Samson, twice each; Jezebel, Jonah, Gabriel, Sheba, Solomon, Saul, Pilate, Israel, Moses, and Ebenezer each once; four from the New Testament, 16 from the Old Testament. The following place-names appear directly: Gomorrah, Bethlehem, Jericho, Eden (most frequently), Gaza, Calvary, Egypt and Galilee.

How are these titles related to the Bible? There are two or three different ways. Many of them are direct quotations of some verse or a part

of a verse from the Scriptures: *Thou Art the Man, More Joy in Heaven, They Seek a Country, This Is My Body, Sweeter than Honey, All Things Are Possible*. All of them are quite easily recognizable.

Others take only a phrase which one might easily fail to recognize as part of a Biblical passage. Here is, for example, *And More Also*, a part of an ancient oath, "Jehovah do so unto Jonathan *and more also*" . . ., *Corn in Egypt, Cities of Refuge, Of Great Riches, Satan as Lightning*, "I beheld Satan as lightning fallen from Heaven" (Luke 10. 18), *Under the Sun*, "There is nothing new under the sun" (Ecclesiastes 1. 9). Incidentally, an interesting game could be made for Biblical students, built around the recognition of such obscure yet familiar phrases.

A number of them make use of persons, around which to build novels—*Joseph, Joseph and His Brethren, Moses, Brother Saul, Wife to Pilate, Sons of Cain*.

Some use a title which is evidently a play upon words of a genuinely Biblical reference. These vary from *Widow's Might*, to *Lilies of the Alley*, which I rightly or wrongly took to be based on the "Lily of the Valley," a phrase found in the Song of Solomon, and a "tinkling symbol."

Others use a contrasting statement built obviously upon a Biblical phrase. Examples here are *Mine Is the Kingdom, She Fell Among Thieves* (a crime story), *In Their Own Image, Unforbidden Fruit, Forgive Us Our Happiness, Lead Me Into Temptation*, and *Unholy City*.

Then, there is the title which, while having no relation to any Biblical setting, nevertheless uses the names of well-known characters and noted places, things or events which are likely to suggest more than they fulfill. Thus, *Eve's Orchard* (Margaret Widdemer). Now here is *Eve*, but in the story she turns out to be a New York girl who gives up her job to return to the Connecticut ancestral home, restores the old house and *orchard* and, forgetting New York, becomes a contented member of the little country community. Is it just accidental that *Orchard* is in the title or does one think: Eve—forbidden fruit—apple—orchard? Apparently the Eve of the story is quite *un-Evelike*, for, says the reviewer, "she is too utterly noble for belief" and her extreme virtue threatens "to submerge one's interest." *Jezebel's Daughter* and *Wife to Pilate* would probably be classed properly here.

But one is likely to ask, "What relation is there between subject-matter and title?" Obviously, I could not take time to seek to determine this in

every case. Here are a few samples which afford some indication at least of that relationship:

Stars in Their Courses, J. H. Jeans: "To be the child of an unhappy marriage is to be heavily handicapped at the outset of that strange, unequal game we call life." Such was the fate of the hero.

And More Also, Elizabeth Carfrae: Hurt by the divorce of her parents, the heroine makes a *vow* that she would never let a child of hers suffer as she had. The time came when she found her vow hard to keep, but love for her daughter conquered in the end.

Under the Fig Leaf, Edwin Greenwood: "A satirical story of what happened to an English village when the new Lord B. decided to try out all his theories on the innocent but far from docile villagers."

How is the oft-used *Eden* employed in relation to the content of the various books? Here are some of the "Edens":

Happier Eden, B. K. Seymour: A man marries believing that he is committing bigamy since he had married ten years earlier in South America. He believes that the blissful ignorance of his wife will make for a *happier Eden* and events prove him right, according to the reviewer.

Storm Over Eden, H. Miller: The story of two sisters, Ann who was pretty, vain and selfish—the other a plain girl who could be relied on to get the other out of scrapes. Two happy marriages solve their problems.

Eden for One, J. Gunther: A boy granted magic to make every wish come true wishes himself into a new world of fantasy which turns out to be a "sorry sort of *Eden for one*."

Sinister Eden, A. E. Dingle: "A story of wild adventure, of piracy, kidnapping and madness on an uninhabited South Sea island." A South Sea thriller!

In Sight of Eden, R. Vercel (trans. from the French): A psychological novel following the unhappy course of marriage between a member of a conservative, old New York family and a successful woman novelist, lovely but cool and aloof, who finds it impossible to reconcile love and work.

It Began in Eden, F. S. Wees: The heroine confronts a problem of choice between a newspaper man and a scholarly college professor. The reporter abducts the heroine on the eve of her wedding.

Outside Eden, J. C. Squire: A volume of short stories mainly about writers and the tricks of the trade. There is no apparent relation to the title unless it arises from one of the stories, "Blame Adam and Eve."

I thought I had been all around Eden, but looking in the list of books of poetry I found one more, *Landscape West of Eden*.

Now, what significance attaches to the rather surprisingly frequent use of Biblical or Biblically derived titles? I do not know the answer. Is

it because it is thought that such a Biblically related title would appeal to people? At this point it would probably be well to remind ourselves that far more than half of these references would not be recognized as Biblical by the average person, not even, I think, by the average intelligent person. Or is it merely because they are clever or well-turned phrases which would appeal because of their cleverness, suggestiveness or beauty? Again I repeat that I am concerned here with the facts I have found. It is to me quite a surprise to find in the titles of books of fiction so large a number Biblically derived. I know of no way of making a comparative study with the past in this respect.

There remains still one other phase of my study as yet incomplete and one that will require a long time to do it justice, namely, to inquire to what extent the Bible enters into contemporary writing in the style and content of the many books that pour in a constant stream from our presses. In this paper the attempt is made to sample only one kind of literature, namely fiction. But how should I do this? Take one representative writer who is widely read and see the extent to which the Bible appears in his work? This would be worth doing some day with a writer like Galsworthy, or Thomas Mann, or Theodore Dreiser, or even Sinclair Lewis. I did not choose this approach.

Finally it was decided to take a group of ten books which had been rated as the ten most outstanding books of the decade 1926-1935. The choice of books was made by Asa Don Dickinson¹ of the Brooklyn Library on the basis of ratings by some forty different persons or organizations who are accustomed to publish estimates of books. A definite rating was arrived at and the ten books that had the highest scores were as follows:

	Score	Year
<i>The Good Earth</i> , Pearl Buck	330	1931
<i>Death Comes for the Archbishop</i> , Willa Cather	306	1927
<i>Bridge of San Luis Rey</i> , Thornton Wilder	246	1928
<i>A Farewell to Arms</i> , Ernest Hemingway	209	1929
<i>Romantic Comedians</i> , Ellen Glasgow	192	1926
<i>Shadows on the Rock</i> , Willa Cather	190	1931
<i>Time of Man</i> , Edith Maddox Roberts	184	1927
<i>Years of Grace</i> , Margaret Ayer Barnes	180	1930
<i>Of Time and the River</i> , Thomas Wolfe	180	1935
<i>Dodsworth</i> , Sinclair Lewis	169	1929

¹ *The Best Books of the Decade, 1926-35*. H. W. Wilson Company, New York, 1937.

These books were read with the view of discovering any Biblical allusions, direct or indirect, that might appear in them. Obviously, the varied nature of the books would lead one to expect very uneven results. Other books by the same authors on other themes might yield quite different results. I am reporting only on those read for whatever it may be worth.

Let me first report that I found comparatively few Biblical references in any of them. They were not read for religious ideas, but only for what seemed quite obviously Biblically derived. Remembering these things, here are some of our results.

The book which stood highest by many points was *The Good Earth*, by Pearl Buck, recent Nobel Prize winner. As I read I checked each reference which I thought was Biblical. When I summed up I discovered that only on 13 of 375 pages had I noted anything even remotely Biblical. Of course, it will be recalled that the book deals intimately with Chinese daily life, a life almost entirely untouched by Christianity. Hence, not much directly Biblical material would be expected. Leafing back over the marked pages there appeared only one reference or allusion that could be categorically declared to be Biblically derived. It was an indirect reference to Jesus on the Cross. Wang Lung, the hero, while in the South, having fled the famine in his own country, is given a picture card on which there was "a picture of a man, white-skinned, who hung upon a crosspiece of wood. The man was without clothes except for a bit about his loins, and to all appearances he was dead, since his head drooped upon his shoulder and his eyes were closed above his bearded lips." Nothing more. There is one other passage which has a Biblical ring: "Some do it for righteousness that men may speak well of them." Other passages were marked only because they seemed to be Biblical in style if not in meaning. I could have marked many, though these few particularly struck me:

"And there was no health in her for him."

"Every night he went in unto her."

"The girl Lotus did what she would with him."

She "had every beauty which had ever come into his mind to desire."

"As he feared, so it happened."

"Now do you leave this affair in my hand. Only tell me which woman it is, . . ."

"It is a bitter thing in my own house and I have no mother's house to go back to any more."

"It is not meet for a man to love his wife with a foolish and overwhelming love as though she were a harlot."

"And Wang Lung took it into his heart to eat dainty foods."

"Well and it is meet, for he has stood guardian over me against evil."

"Now to Wang Lung it seemed there was nothing left to be desired in his condition, . . ."

In this book I find the strongest Biblical flavor of any of the ten. But it is apparent in the style rather than the content. I seem to recall that some reviewers of this book remarked on its style as being like that of the King James Bible. Certainly, it is more Biblelike than any other modern book that I have read. Nor is this accidental, for Pearl Buck grew up in the home of a Bible-reading missionary family.

In *Death Comes for the Archbishop*, by Willa Cather, one might well expect to find not a few Biblical allusions. Yet on only 16 pages out of 303 did I discover anything Biblical. Of these, three were merely references to the Cross—one to the Cross and the Virgin; one to the Saviour on the Cross; one to the flight into Egypt; one to "Our Father"; one to Christ and the Keys of His Church; one to Calvary; one to the scourging of Jesus; and one to the Bride of Christ. Three verses from the New Testament are quoted: "She hath not dealt so with any nation," "Unless ye become as little children," "Whosoever is least among you, the same shall be first in the kingdom of God." There is one reference to the sufferings of Paul, and finally there is one passage which seemed rather Biblical in style: "They sank down upon their knees in that blessed spot and kissed the earth, for they perceived what family it was that had entertained them there." There are other terms, such as Virgin, which are perhaps ultimately derived from the Bible, and there is much discussion of religion and the Church. But these do not seem to derive from the Bible directly.

I confess that I expected to find more Biblical matter in Thornton Wilder's *Bridge of San Luis Rey* than was found. Treating as it does of the attempt by Brother Juniper to explain why the famous bridge should have fallen at the precise time that it did, carrying to death five persons, it should offer an excellent opportunity for the use of the Bible. Yet I found I had marked but 11 pages. There were many references to things religious and

ecclesiastic, but directly traceable to the Bible only the following: One reference to "sons and daughters of Adam"; a reference to Second Corinthians in connection with a letter containing a remarkable paragraph about love—it is in First Corinthians, 13, that Paul's famous love passage is found); one reference to the Cross; one to the Crucifixion; one to the Blood and Body of Christ; one to the Gift of Tongues; one to the Second Coming of Christ; one to the Return of the Lord; and two verses of Scripture are quoted: "How is it possible that I shall have a child?" the question of the Virgin to Gabriel at the Annunciation; and "I shall fear no evil."

One feels that Wilder probably knows his Bible. His other book, *Heaven Is My Destination*, built around a generally religious theme, might yield more definite indications of Biblical material, but it is not one of the ten books.

Probably no one who knows anything about Ernest Hemingway and *A Farewell to Arms* would look for much Biblically derived material in that widely read and highly praised novel. As a matter of fact, I found but eight passages which I could mark. There are numerous uses of the divine name, but mostly used in what, to an American, is profanity. The Latins—for the story is laid in Italy—use quite freely such expressions as *por Dios*, "by God," so I did not count these. In one passage, however, a poor soldier wounded by an exploding shell, cries out, "O Jesus, shoot me, Christ, shoot me, O Mary, purest lovely Mary, shoot me! Stop it! Stop it! O Jesus, lovely Mary, stop it! then choking, 'mama, mama mia,' he was quiet, biting his arm, the stump of his leg twitching."

In a dialogue between the hero and the priest there is a discussion of love and loving God which has something Biblical about it, though it derives from no single Biblical passage. Another wounded man pleads "For Christ's sweet sake, take me to a hospital room." There is one definite reference to the temptation in Eden in the following dialogue: "I am the snake. I am the snake of Reason." "You're getting it mixed. The Apple was Reason." "No, it was the snake."

Twice within two pages Saint Paul is referred to and the verse, "Take a little wine for your stomach's sake," quoted. Once reference is made to the Last Supper: "'What are you eating meat for?' Rinaldi turned to the priest; 'don't you know it's Friday?' 'It's Thursday,' the priest said. 'It's a lie. It's Friday. You're eating the body of Our Lord. It's God-meat.

I know. It's dead Austrian. That's what you're eating.' 'The white meat is from officers,' I said, completing the old joke."

And, finally, a Biblical reference appears again in a conversation between the hero and the padre, the hero saying:

"I didn't mean technically Christian. I mean like Our Lord."

The priest said nothing.

"We are all gentler now because we are beaten. How would Our Lord have been if Peter had rescued Him in the Garden?"

"He would have been just the same." (priest)

"I don't think so," I said.

There is not much here that is Biblical. Much of it is distasteful, and repulsive. Yet it must be said that few writers have painted war in more realistic colors than Hemingway, or made it appear more horrible and impossible. Perhaps there is something quite genuinely Biblical, at least in the New Testament sense, in this fact.

Ellen Glasgow's *The Romantic Comedians* is the well-told story of an elderly widower who falls in love with and marries a young woman, with the resulting complications that might easily have been foreseen. Here one would expect to find, and does find, very little. Eight pages were checked in my reading. There was one reference to the Ten Commandments; one to reading the Bible; one to "the wages of sin"; and one to a "cloud of witnesses." "Like the apostles he had fought with beasts and conquered" is a very definite Biblical reference. A whimsical remark by his physician to the elderly hero may have some Biblical basis, "Trust in God, and keep your diet light."

That is the sum of it. Incidentally, one cannot help wondering how this book, along with some of the others, ever got into this list.

Shadows on the Rock, by Willa Cather, is the story of an apothecary and his daughter, laid in old Quebec in the early eighteenth century. It recounts the more or less intimate domestic life of the family during a period of about one year. With such a Catholic setting it is to be expected that frequent reference would be made to the Church and to religion, especially to the Virgin and the Saints. As in *Death Comes for the Archbishop*, which also had a Catholic setting, the number of rather clearly Biblical references is small.

Most of the references pertain to the life of Jesus and the greater number are to His childhood, or the events of His early life. There are

three references to the child Jesus, three to the mother of Jesus, once the manger appears, the Holy Family is twice referred to, and a detailed description of the Christmas story is given, which the characters in the novel represented with small, doll-like figures. There is one reference to the Holy Apostles, two to the King of Heaven, two to the Blessed Sacrament; there is one reference to the miracles of Jesus, another to the Judgment of God, and one to the box of precious ointment with which Jesus was anointed and which the disciples thought might have been better used. There are occasional references to "Our Lord," a quite natural expression in the peculiar setting in which the story is laid.

Margaret Ayer Barnes' *Years of Grace* is the story of a Chicago family in the late 'nineties and the twentieth century down through the post-war period. It is built around the loves of Jane Ward and is undoubtedly a fair picture of the life of a typical Gold Coast family during that period. One is not surprised to find comparatively few Biblical references here. There is reference once to the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer being read in the schoolroom. A similar reference to the reading of the Bible in college chapel appears later. A Scripture verse somewhat modified appears in the description of the president of the college which Jane was attending. "She speaks with the tongue of angels and of men." Twenty-three years of the story had passed before the next Biblical allusion is made in reference to a statue of Eve. "Jane wondered vaguely what Eve had looked like after twenty years with Adam, after Cain and Abel had disappointed her. Why had no one ever thought of doing Eve at the age of fifty-one?" The only other Biblical reference was one to the creation story in Genesis: "Chicago," thought Jane solemnly, "makes you believe in Genesis. It makes you believe that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth."

Thomas Wolfe's *Of Time and the River* turns out to have more Biblical references, direct or modified, than any of the other nine books reviewed, and uses more and longer quotations. Thus: "To a strange land—a stranger among strange people;" "The voice of a prophet calling from a mountain top;" "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen;" "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth;" "The woman gave me of the tree and I did eat;" "He who had been lost was found again;" "Cast not your pearls before swine;" "Like Moses he must strike water from the common stone of life,

and like Samson must take honey from the lion's maw of the great world;" "Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook or his tongue with a cord that thou lettest down?" Other phrases used, some of them a number of times, are: Armageddon, Day of Judgment, Day of Reckoning, the Chariots of Moloch, the Beasts of the Apocalypse, the Chosen, "crying out in the wilderness," Potiphar's wife, whore of Babylon, Abel, Ruth, the Pentateuch, the Crucifixion of Christ, Magdalene, the Virgin, "fall among thieves." The story of the rich young ruler is told in its entirety. There is reference to the separation of the sheep on God's right hand and the goats on His left. The Bible as a book is referred to a number of times, particularly the Old Testament. In one rather lengthy passage there is a discussion of the literary qualities of the Old Testament. "The quality of the writing of the Old Testament may take rank with the best writing that has ever been done," says one of the characters, "but the amount of great writing is much less than it is commonly supposed to be. There are passages, nay, books, of the vilest rubbish," and here he gives passages from the "begatting" sections. Referring to the scriptural saying "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," Old Bascom said, "That, my boy, is the mightiest line, the most magnificent poetry ever written. And suddenly the old man cried, "O my God! My God! The beauty and the pity of it all!"

There is a reference to the earthquake at the death of Jesus; a play upon an Old Testament episode is clearly indicated in the words of Bascom: "Almighty, come down and give this ass a tongue, as Thou didst once before in Balaam's time." The book closes with a Biblical passage from the Song of Solomon: "Set me as a seal upon thine heart, for love is as strong as death; jealousy as cruel as the grave: the coals thereof are the coals of fire." One feels that while this book is full of profanity and vulgarity, as no other books the writer has read, Wolfe had no slight acquaintance with the Bible.

Dodsworth, by Sinclair Lewis, is the story of a successful American business man who retires from business and, with his superficially brilliant wife, takes a trip to Europe. Essentially he is a decent person, thoughtful, possessed of good taste and a personality arrested in college by the pressure of doing the popular thing and later by the pressure of making a considerable fortune. First he finds himself with difficulty getting used to foreign ways. It is not until he returns to America that he begins to question some of his former beliefs, the intelligence of his friends, the superiority of his own wife. He returns to Europe with his mind open to new ideas. He

gains a cosmopolitan view of art, culture, and capitalism. His standards change. In the meantime Europe has been bringing out his wife's character. She has several love affairs, she becomes more and more selfish and icy toward Dodsworth as she comes to be admired by European men. Finally she asks for a divorce so that she can marry an impecunious German of noble connections. Poor Dodsworth, who has always worshiped his wife, goes about Europe with a broken heart. Though she has shown herself flighty and superficial in her choice of friends and culture alike he cannot forget her. In the midst of his sorrow he meets a woman, truly refined, retiring, cosmopolitan, and at the same time completely human. But when Fran, his wife, writes that her German nobleman will not marry her he returns to his wife—but not for long. He soon realizes that he cannot stand her, that she is undermining his self-esteem, trampling on his future hopes—and he returns to the other woman.

One would not, I think, approach any book by Sinclair Lewis, unless it might be *Elmer Gantry*, with the expectation of finding much that is Biblical. *Dodsworth* contains very few references to the Bible. He mentions once the Ten Commandments, speaks of "this Image of God" in describing man, once uses the phrase "Biblical humility," once says "since the Lord created the world," once again uses the adjective Biblical, and once modifies the Biblical saying "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth" to read, "If I forget thee, O England, . . ."

Here, then, are the results of a study of the ten most highly rated American novels and the sum of their Biblical references. What, to use a Biblical expression, is the conclusion of the whole matter? There doesn't really seem to be any, and perhaps, therefore, the time consumed in reading this article has been spent with little profit. The most that can be said is that here are some facts bearing upon a problem which to many religious educators and lovers of the Bible seems to be important. The writer's conclusion, perhaps not wholly warranted scientifically, is that the Bible is not playing as important a part in the literature of the present as it has in the past. There may be in this some suggestion for Biblical scholars and those interested in the Bible. Writers are not likely to use greatly a book with which they have little acquaintance. If future writers are to carry on what we believe to be the tradition of the past, the rising generation must be given a better opportunity to come to know and to appreciate the Book of Books.

"Who's Who" As Friendship's Garland

JOHN SHERIDAN ZELIE

IF religion is what a man does with his solitude, as Professor Whitehead declares, then *Who's Who in America* has become one of the altar books of my religion. Sometimes I put it on the Epistle side of the altar for instruction, warning or exhortation, but more often move it over to the Gospel side for sheer good news. In less liturgical moments I call it "Friendship's Garland" and use the two figures interchangeably. I have never been hypersensitive about mixed metaphors since a distinguished speaker at Harvard said, "This enthusiasm is kindled at other fountains," and the address is still read as an unchallenged classic.

"Well, who is it now?" the family inquire as I run to look up somebody, and when I tell them they are nonplused as to why I am interested in that quarter, or about the odd combinations I make, as when by mere accident and with no connection whatever I happened to look up the same evening William Allan Neilson and William Allen White, the one because he was resigning the presidency of Smith College, an experience which always gives me a thrill, and the other because something had just brought to mind that gorgonzola editorial of long ago, "What's the Matter with Kansas?"

The family sit around hoping someone will drop in, but with a turn of my wrist I summon in a dozen first, second and third class, and even tourist companions by means of *Who's Who*. I often jump up from the table to look into it, and in a minute have enlarged and enriched the company. My nearest of kin submit, but seldom very respectfully, that I am probably losing my mind. Though they are lax and casual about many a more vital and important doctrine, they are fundamentalist to the core, and would go to the stake for this one.

They have no idea what a juicy and succulent matter dates may become. It is only lately that I have discovered it myself, but I am now almost Chinese in my zest for knowing how old anyone is, and I relish more than a bird's-nest pudding or that other Chinese delicacy, shark's-fin soup, the pleasant surprise that some supposed coeval is really six years older than I am. For a fortnight I feel much more in tune with the infinite. But I am quite down-in-the-mouth on learning that another intimate has all the while been five years

younger than myself and never said a word about it. Hoping this is a mistake, I write and demand an explanation, but he is ribald about it and laughs me to scorn. A subsequent attack of lumbago, which I hear has befallen him in Syracuse, cheers me much as likely to even things up even yet.

Often enough I look into this treasury just to make sure that someone "is still there," like The Star Spangled Banner. He had stood me in such good stead for years by insisting that I was "all there," when the family were doing little to reinforce that belief. I look up Robert Frost rather hoping that he will stay just as he is, and I would be content with that for a long time to come. In an idle moment, I run upon the provocative statement that Gertrude Stein was born in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, but even though I know the editors of this volume to be judicious and careful, I balk at that and don't believe a word of it. It doesn't make sense. I am not surprised that Alice B. Toklas is not there at all because I had never believed she was anywhere. As one thing leads to another, I turn over to Louis Bromfield, who did me an unforgettable good turn twenty years ago, but for the life of me cannot make out how he and Gertrude Stein ever became intimate. Of course this way of doing things does seem rather like that of O. O. McIntyre. He would suddenly ask something like this: "What has become of Gerald Stanley Lee?" and then pass right on to something else, instead of looking him up in *Who's Who* and finding he is almost the last American who is exactly where he was forty years ago. By "sponging a read" in an excellent biography of McIntyre in the Book Nook at Daytona, I felt more kindly toward McIntyre on discovering that like Bliss Carman he was always reading the dictionary. This encourages discursiveness. I hasten to annex one more item about Gladys Hasty Carroll, as I would about anybody who had sense enough to admit that "if there is anything she hates to do it is to iron collars and clean out desk drawers, but she will jump at the chance to do either when her hour for writing draws near." There is a woman after anyone's own heart; and I like to throw around such a person the concrete background of Bates College and South Berwick, Maine, and add a couple of dates that quite make my mouth water. Her last title, *A Few Foolish Ones*, emboldens me to add myself to the list.

Sometimes I just go "thumbing a ride" along our national highway, and who should give me a lift one day, out San Diego way, but the author of "Curfew Must Not Ring Tonight," Rose Hartwick Thorpe. This had been in boyhood my favorite piece of "must" legislation. How it brought back my

early, barn-storming, elocutionary, country-academy days when I roused the villagers with it at school exhibitions. Anyone who had dared fool with the curfew on those nights would have been tarred and feathered. And when she dropped me and I had said, "Thanks a lot," as a hitch-hiker should, and was still stepping westward, thumbing the pages a little further among the T's, I was taken on by our good Doctor Townsend of Two-Hundred-Dollars-a-Month-Revolving-Pension fame. As usual, he was none too particular as to whom he picked up or where he landed him.

On the Gospel side once more I find recorded the plight, fate or reward, as the case may be, of the Arch-Socialist of whom I had quite lost track. For years he had lectured the life out of all and sundry at dollar and dollar-and-a-half luncheons about the impending breakup of pretty nearly everything, if something wasn't done before nightfall by those present about the dangerous uselessness of the Church. And here he was, all quieted down and smoothed out as Registrar of the Diocese of Vermont! Let the good work go on. Who knows but that Norman Thomas, who has deserved well of his kind, may yet come to rest as Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Jersey City? This would place him near enough to Mayor Hague to keep his hand in. The beauty of *Who's Who* is that if you read it properly it makes you think of everything else, and I thought at once of what Martin Luther said about his too faithful colleague, Melancthon, that "He wished Philip Melancthon would stop trying to run the whole world." And what an irony of fate that Melancthon's mantle should fall on Hitler. I still roll as a sweet morsel under my tongue the over-the-fence remark of a cheerfully jaded farmer in Litchfield county as he paused in hoeing his dejected garden. "Oh!" said he, "when I was young I felt just as you do. I wanted to take this old world with the Rocky Mountains in one hand and the Himalayas in the other and give the whole shebang a good shaking up." With my relish for particulars, I asked what happened, and he replied, "Well, to come right down to it, it wa'nt very long before I lost my 'holt' on the Himalayas, and after that, I couldn't seem to get a good purchase on anything, and here I am fussing around on these foothills of the Berkshires." Bliss Perry once spoke of how much more tang and edge "holt" has than the proper word.

At my last foray into the living room Saint Theresa inquires, "Who now?" as if it could not make the slightest difference who it was; but for once she was all interest when I stated that it was the eminent brain surgeon, Harvey Cushing. I never saw him but I had diligently collected every little

scrap I could gather about him from his books, colleagues, relatives or patients. Theresa feels that for me this is going pretty far as, perhaps, it is, and in her humble way tries to ease the strain by suggesting that there is an eminent bone surgeon not five blocks away who would seem to be more in my line.

I hardly look any more to see what degrees anyone may have, either "ornery" or earned, preferring to "take them as read," like the Minutes of the Last Meeting. And nearly everyone looks more interesting to me than the books he has written. Place-names engage me rapturously, and I reflect how funny it would feel to be born in Knobnoster, Missouri, or Clam Run, Maine. I keep an ever-growing list of English place-names and would so gladly own "*Who's Who* in Great Britain" were it not for its prohibitive cost, a secondhand and out-of-date copy even being beyond my purse until I hear again from the good Doctor Townsend. Perhaps my favorite English name is Stamford-in-the-Vale-cum-Goosey. When once on an American train I asked the English stranger, who was my seat-mate, what his home town was, and he said, "Stamford," I nearly shouted with joy, "Not Stamford-in-the-Vale-cum-Goosey?" And blushing and laughing he said, "Yes, but we do not stress the Goosey."

Lest I should seem to be attracted only by celebrities, I linger over a lot of the shortest notices, trying to emulate William James who said, "He was done with bigness in all its forms." A brevity about a real-estate agent looks restful and I pounce down upon it, but only to find that he has given one hundred and sixty acres and four million dollars to a university. I fear America is no place in which to be done with bigness. Trying again, I alight upon a six-line notice, but it turns out to be a Supreme Court Justice in Tennessee. I am hopeful about a still smaller notice, but this records that the person described is the head of one of the half-dozen greatest corporations in the country. His brief account of himself suggests the saying of Mr. Lorimer's "Self-Made Merchant to His Son," that "The head of the firm is the only member of it whose feelings do not matter in the least." But even so, I think of what William Watson once said:

"Of moment to himself as I to me
Is every child of man that ever woman bore.
Once in a lightning flash of sympathy,
I felt this truth, a moment and no more."

The surprises of *Who's Who* are endless. Some are caused by my naïve

habit of assuming that my friends must always be of the same age they were when I first met them. While they do not object to this, it often throws my reckoning out by a matter of twenty years or so. I shared the adventure years ago of living with a friend in adjoining rooms at a shilling a day per person in Carlyle's Chelsea, and after we parted, I did not particularly notice what was happening. So it seemed as if he were taking an unfair advantage of me when, a few years since, he bloomed out in a portly and costly non-fiction bestseller, which promptly passed into a library permanence. But he had warned me about it, as I found on fishing up a letter he had written while engaged on the aforesaid opus, telling me all about it. He had rather put me off the track by writing about it as follows: "And now with my next chapter before, . . . , I am as helpless as a stone. Everything is opaque and cold and I fumble over my notes with a feeling of nausea. How to make that cloud look like a man! For five mornings I have faced my desk with a blank and black despair and I feel that I am dead and done with. This is what you get by asking how things go in . . ." And then, while midway in the sequel to this volume, taking a few prizes like the Pulitzer and such on the way, he asks me to stop and visit him, saying that I will not be interrupting anything as he "has lost all power of stringing two ideas together." So I stopped to lunch with him and he let me fondle the new manuscript he was "fumbling" with, but I could not quite focus on it for the sheer joy of him himself. I am all in favor of the opinion of Bernard of Clairvaux that "all that a man ever did or all the institutions he built pass away and only what he built into himself remains." And being now on the Gospel side of the altar again, I picked up more good news in the presence at the lunch table of a lady of more than four score years of such zest and blitheness as to make a permanent addition to my biographical store. The dessert was made from apples contributed by Bruce Rogers, and that was enough to send me off on leaving the house into fresh inquisitiveness about him when I got home, which led straight, a few months later, into a complete exhibition of his art and a full account of his life.

Editors are the hardest to find out about, but I treasure the least item about them, like a recent British warship's being named for that great editor, *Delane*. Editors do have a good deal to do with war. Saint Theresa has just stuck her head in the window, and learning that I am now at work on editors, blithely states that I am almost sure to achieve a good style on that subject because Walter Pater, a favorite of hers, once said that "one secret

of a good style is a full rich matter to deal with." That portfolio of rejection slips which I cherish, she feels ought to furnish all I could wish to know about editors. But it never did. I sometimes feel that I canonized Theresa too soon and ought to have proceeded no further than beatifying her at first. I like the very aged editor who attributed his health and longevity to the fact that he had never pleased anybody and never tried to. Even so slight a gem as Rollo Ogden of *The Times* going to The Algonquin for one night and staying for the next twenty years is something to keep, and along with that, a new person in the host of that Wayward Inn. Another editor always reminds me of Emerson's visit to Ruskin, which Emerson described as "solid gloom."

It is a tragedy of waste to let the editors escape biography. The two best evenings I can remember were two that I spent with them. The one with the London editor lasted from 6 P. M to 2 A. M. and began by his announcing that just yesterday he had finished a biography. Incidentally, he said that he owned four thousand biographies and thought he knew what was in them all. In his vast library, walled with books, he led the way through little lanes between thousands of them symmetrically placed on the floor, to his chair beside a mild open fire which he kept going even in August, "just for company," as he said. And such a night. I thought it never could happen again, but it did last summer when a New York editor asked me to dine with him. He was just retired. I had not seen him in twenty years, but the Garland oriented me by letting me know he was just turned seventy-five, and I looked for a grave and edifying evening. But not a bit of it. Very literally I had reckoned without my host. He, too, had just finished a biography which was already going strong. And he had invited in another editor whom I had much wanted to see. Within five minutes my host was off like a house on fire in raptures about the garden scene below his Greenwich Village window, and from then on till past midnight,

"The palace buzz'd and banged and clacked,
And all the long-pent stream of life
Flowed downward like a cataract."

I had naïvely hoped I was keeping up with current events, but between these two, I felt like a born back-number. Artemus Ward once said of Jefferson Davis that it would have been ten dollars in his pocket if he had never been born, and at moments I felt as Davis might have felt in that predicament, but

I wouldn't have missed that evening for anything. The ten dollars would long since have been squandered on paying just debts, but that editorial evening still gives out its emanations, like the first editorial night, as undiminished as radium. If there was any lag for a moment in the talk the younger one of the two immediately more than made up for it. About all I could contribute to it was by trying to believe James Boswell's opinion that "a generous and elevated mind is distinguished by nothing more certainly than an eminent degree of curiosity," and egging on the other two. The title of an old and classic Scottish essay on "People of Whom More Might Be Made" comes back to me as I think of the wealth that may yet open to us when editors emerge from their anonymity and low visibility as Mr. Villard has just done, reminding us of Hazlitt, whose last words, after years of unceasing controversy were, "Well, I have had a happy life."

Who's Who often records what a man's religion is. When I once asked a coeditor what his chief's religion was, he replied, "Well, for the life of me, I don't believe I ever knew." It seemed to me that it would not have been nosy or indelicate for him to know at least whether he was a Three-Button-Dunker or an Old-Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit-Calvinistic-Baptist. We are so absurdly touchy and polite about such matters nowadays that there is now only one sect about which anybody can say anything he pleases without offense and that is the Sandemanians. They are clean gone out of existence, but not until they had annexed Michael Faraday. Many excellent people mourn the good old days when, on occasion, and under great strain of spirits, they could let fly now and then at the other denominations and no harm done. For myself, I would go so far as to say that there is one very large, powerful and worthy denomination in the country which has always lacked *charm*. But I will never name it. Even Saint Theresa cannot wheedle it out of me, but the gentle reader should be allowed to pull one oar on such matters, and family circles here and there may spend a pleasant evening guessing which one it is. In Williamstown, Massachusetts, now hopelessly urbane, they still relish the broadside of a long ago Boanerges, who, addressing the local public said, "Now among the churches there is always a stronger and a weaker sect. And in my judgment the weaker sect is always the 'Episcopals.'" Even the Episcopals cherish that.

I have developed a positive gusto about retired people, ready to suspect that they may be more interesting than ever. Some friends in raptures over a New England sunset last summer, and moved to a friendly word to the

village simpleton who had drawn near, said to him, "You must be glad to live where they have such beautiful sunsets." To which he replied cheerily, "Yes, and the funny thing about them is they most always come late in the afternoon." It would seem that something like this ought also to happen to people. I was deploring to my favorite crisp young mechanic at the village garage the gradual disappearance of the village idiot. Looking at me with some disgust he said, "Humph, if its half-wits you want, I could show you six of them right around here." When he named the six I remonstrated about two of them that he must be wrong, everybody treated them as leading citizens. "Yes, so they do, and if you ask *me*, that's just what's the matter with this village."

I hardly glance at a promotion any more, but one high-grade resignation fills me with more rapture than ten men who have been made Chairmen of the Board. While I would not go quite as far as the old Bostonian who, pausing to gaze at the passers-by on the Common, said to his companion, "I'd give my right arm to know what all those people are thinking about," I would give a good deal to hear Mr. Justice Brandeis tell in detail about his first and subsequent weeks off the Bench. I like to think he is having, and has prepared for, the time of his life. Medieval preachers were said to be sure of a full congregation when they took for their theme, "The First Five Minutes After Death." The very thought of resigning is often a relay of energy. A British journalist at the age of sixty told me that he had thought of resigning ever since he was twenty-three. The thought was so energizing even at sixty that he then went on for twelve years more. I always liked Beth, that maid-servant of the Archbishop Benson family who at sixteen, after one year's service, could not stand it any longer, but was persuaded to stay on for one year more. She consented and remained for seventy-two years more, incidentally ruling the whole house.

A shoal of college presidents, who are just now outward-bound, fill me with Boswell's afore-mentioned "eminent degree of inquisitiveness." What an interesting leap from Cornell to Brewster, New York, or from Hamilton to New Britain, Connecticut, or from Yale to the movies. One of them I have now chased through three presidencies into a great insurance company and am now freshly agog with curiosity about an apple orchard which I hear he has purchased in Vermont, wondering if that is final. A chance meeting with the retired art professor on a roadside in New Jersey reveals him as more blithe and chipper than ever, as he declares he is done worrying about

or trying to do anything for humanity at large. He is quite willing to do anything he can for such men and women as come his way, but as for humanity at large and in the gross he is not going to haunt himself with it any more. He seemed to feel like the Harvard professor who said about his colleagues that, individually, they were the finest he had ever known, but collectively they were often possessed with seven devils.

Since no trifle is too small for Friendship's Garland, I add to my treasure trove of the retired that little gem of the man who, on the day he severed his long connection with his magazine, celebrated his exit by going out into the park that faced his office, taking a seat on a bench in the spring sunlight and gazing long at his building in order to savor the whole experience at leisure before he departed for the rest of life to his original Berkshires.

The youngish Stuart Chase, who always seems to me of the same age he was when I first became interested in him, prophesies from his Georgetown retreat the near approach of a time when the population will be static, the long rule of the Younger Generation will be over and the elderly will occupy a commanding place. Panting and gasping educators looking for a new problem to make addresses out of, have already fastened on this as a perfect godsend of a subject and are making arrangements in advance for a time when there will be a good deal of leisure. And steeping one's self in *Who's Who* would seem to be as good a way as any to prepare for a time when at last one is sure to see more of his fellow men. My friend the essayist chides me about this and says "it isn't done" and all that. He thinks it is rather low and mundane to want to know about persons. "Grandma called it carnal." He states further that he thinks I have a job lot of friends anyway, to which I reply that there is much to be said for that proposition as he himself is the earliest and oldest of them. The others have badgered me for years to know what I can find in him. But he thinks I ought to be content to sublimate folks, extract their quintessence as the bee does from the flower and pass on. And I don't want to pass on, I want to hang around. Their is much to be said for this hanging around after everybody else is done with anybody. 'Tis like what Bliss Perry said about William James, that he would sit through the whole evening at the Boston club and never say a word and then when he rode home with him in the trolley he would talk like an archangel. And as for that bee, I have been much cheered of late by a bee expert who told me that in some respects the bee seemed to have no intelligence at all. My friend the parodist says he wishes he could savor all sorts

and conditions of men the way the Prayer Book and I do, but he can't, and frankly he is sorry for most of them though willing I should keep on this way if I can get any pleasure out of it. The quintessence business may be all right for a scientist but I much prefer a great cloud of witnesses such as Edward Fitzgerald said he always felt when he was reading Shakespeare. When asked what was his favorite work, the late Colonel Repington replied, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, which he considered suitable for reading in any spare quarter of an hour.

This is not to say that I am not a serious and moderately industrious person or that I do not go about all the ordinary tasks like other people. Nobody knows anything about this Who's Who habit. I go along the street looking as lucid as anybody, St. Theresa dissenting. I am nearly always up at sunrise. I write articles and if anybody should say he does not happen ever to have noticed any of them I cheerfully reply that that is the kind of articles they are and no feelings hurt. I teach classes. I do errands around at the chain stores and come home laden with bags of Vitamins A. and P. and talk with the neighbors who notice nothing wrong. The trouble about confessing to one's minor delights is that when you let on about them people are sure to think you do that all the time. Once when I was caught working a week with a wheelbarrow in Dedham, and looked it, a visiting friend who came upon me suddenly was all put about and said he never supposed I did anything more strenuous than browse over Cathedrals, just because once he had heard me exuberate about the remote and lonely Saint David's. It is apt to be as with Zaccheus, about whom the world only remembers that once he climbed a tree and flies to the conclusion that he never did anything else, ignoring the fact that he was a very successful administrative man and capable of an amazingly intimate and personal and conversational evening, let the right person get hold of him. As a matter of fact I am so fed up with Hitler and the news about him that as a defense mechanism I regularly take large doses of other fellow men.

Man in Revolt¹

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

THIS encyclopedic volume is an English translation of the book first published in German, 1937, under the title: *Der Mensch im Widerspruch: Die Christliche Lehre vom wahren und vom wirklichen Menschen*, which would read, *Man in Contradiction: The Christian Doctrine of the True Man and of Actual Man As He Is*. The English title has been selected by Doctor Brunner.

The book deals with one of the crucial issues in modern theology and life, namely, that of the nature of man and the way of redemption for man. The thesis of the book is that man, created by the Creator, has made (and makes) himself the center of life and in so doing has brought (and brings) about a contradiction in his nature that cannot be overcome by himself. The solution to man's contradiction, which Brunner reiterates in many places in this book, is that we have lost the Word which is the real ground of created life, and therefore genuine humanity has been taken from us. The way to man's original destiny has been blocked. The way is reopened both in knowledge and in love by God who became man to restore man's existence and knowledge, his responsibility. The whole meaning of truth in Christian revelation is expressed in the word "love." Man's response to God's Word makes man truly human. The divine solution is the only one.

The Bible's message, the Word of God, is in conflict with man and with all human conceptions of man. Therefore, all theology is dialectic, and the true doctrine of man must be "beaten out on the anvil of continual argument with man's own view of himself." But man's relation to the Word of God even as a sinner does not absolve him from responsibility. This Brunner states emphatically as he argues for a completely theological anthropology, in opposition to Karl Barth, who, Brunner feels, absolves man from responsibility to God's Word in creation by making man out to be completely bereft of the *imago dei*.

The main contents of the book are divided into three parts. The first deals with the introductory problems concerning the riddle of man, man's own view of his significance and the variety of views men hold of their own

¹ *Man in Revolt*. By Emil Brunner. Trans. by Clive Wyon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$6.00.

nature, the peculiar problem of man's confrontation with himself. Various anthropologies are treated, including those of Marx, Darwin, Nietzsche, Freud, the mystics, the romanticists, the idealists, and the realists.

The second section, the heart of the book, is entitled "Foundations." The presuppositions of a Christian doctrine of man, to be sure, involve God's revelation of Himself, which gives us a point of departure in determining who and what man is. Revealed knowledge does not contradict knowledge gained empirically, since empirical knowledge carries within it a hint of the divine Word about man. Man understands himself only in the Word. The Word of God is the ground of all being. Creation is restored in redemption, but more is involved in redemption than restoration, namely, consummation. Some enlightening writing on the Trinity, election, the relation of biology and psychology to theology, and the God-rooted essence of even the godless man is contained within this section. The remainder of this part of the book deals with the *imago dei*, the destruction of the *imago* and the conflict between the origin of (in the Word), and the contradiction in, man. Brunner describes various ways in which the original state of man has been interpreted. He regards the Reformers as restorers of the unity of man, in opposition to those who advocate a dual interpretation of man, as in Catholic anthropology, which holds to an *imago* and a *similitudo* in man, the first destroyed by sin and the second retained. Brunner here feels closer to Luther who championed the unity of man, saying that the image of God has been destroyed but that a "relic" has remained, just enough to keep man a *humanum*. Here Brunner cites Barth as the champion of that doctrine which regards the image of God in man as destroyed and man's relation with God severed; "the *humanum* has become a *profanum*." Brunner believes that the abandonment of the historical character of the "Adam narrative" has helped us to steer clear of the confusion of the Reformers who did not know how to relate the relic of the *imago* to the undeniably human. Thus we are able to avoid a foundation for the basis of fallen man which could be attacked by rationalistic criticism. "So long as the doctrine of the Primitive State was burdened with the Adam narrative, rationalistic criticism could make short work of it."

Space forbids outlining some of Brunner's arguments as regards "original sin" (in which he criticizes Augustine for practically identifying sin with physical inheritance), the radical nature of sin as inherent in the self and not merely in man's acts, the relation of Adam to posterity, the relation of man's sin to the Fall, the solidarity of social man in sin. The manifestations of man's

contradiction are found in man's conception of his greatness, his sense of misery, the conflict of opinions in his attempt to find a synthesis, the recognition of the contradiction in non-Christian thought, and the presence of fear, longing and despair in all men.

The third section of the book, entitled "Development of the Theme," consists of twelve parts, all dealing with the implications and relevance of Christian anthropology to such aspects of life as the unity of personality, the decay of personality, the human spirit and reason, the problem of freedom, the individual and the community, man and woman, soul and body, individuality and humanity, character, the growth of man and evolution, man and the cosmos, man and history, man in his earthly life and man in death. This section contains much that is found in Brunner's *Divine Imperative*. It is an exceptionally practical section and touches upon many points of relevant interest.

The epilogue contains the meaning of the Gospel's proposal for the removal of the contradiction between man as he is and man as he is intended to be. The appendix chapters deal with the teaching of the Bible and the Church on the *imago dei* doctrine, the relation of Law to the Gospel, the problem of natural theology and the "point of contact," the understanding of man in ancient philosophy and in Christianity, and the philosophical and theological conceptions of anthropology.

Brunner has written a very valuable work, and like his *Mediator* and *The Divine Imperative*, this volume is encyclopedic as well as intensely interesting and practical. Intelligent laymen would find this book helpful and readable. Many a sermon suggestion is to be found in it. The copious footnotes and references to interpreters, ancient and modern, will delight the scholar. The book abounds in short and crisp sentences, some of which are indeed eloquent for clarity and simplicity. Brunner does not forget that "the Christian faith is utterly simple." And to make sure that there is complete understanding of his central thesis, Brunner often repeats many things in different contexts. There are no obfuscations in this volume, although one will find now and then those paradoxical statements which puzzle so many practical Americans.

Of course, some sensitive readers will object to Brunner's conception of the "Adam narrative," the Fall, original sin, and, perhaps, the idea that there is a "relic" of the image of God left in man. To be sure, Barth would raise his objections to Brunner's natural theology which makes too little of

the radical grace and revelation of God by allowing for too much Word in creation. Others might object to Brunner's radical conception of evil; his radical idea of God's Word as the only source of knowledge and of human restoration and consummation; his staunch defense of the Trinity, election, the faith of the Reformers; his relegation of philosophical thought to a place of subordination to revelation in the Word.

There is an indication in this book that Brunner has moved from Barth, and that while the latter is traveling more and more into a strict theological position based upon the Word of God (even in his politics!)—the former is making room for many of the insights that were his in his more liberal days. It is not our intention to pass on the merits of their development, nor to prophesy what the final end of these two great theologians will be. This volume of Brunner's is based largely upon Brunner's appreciation of Kierkegaard, Luther, Gogarten, Ebner and Buber. Yet, the Reformers are not to be followed wholly, since there is much they did not see which we face. The problem of freedom and unfreedom is one such problem. Thus it can be seen that Brunner is making more room for the "natural man," although he binds the natural man to a life of responsibility because even in his sin he is related to the Word of God in creation.

The book would have been greatly improved had a topical index been included, and perhaps an index of scriptural references. The English translation is almost better than the original German, and Miss Wyon deserves credit for her careful work which has been one of the great ministries of the Christian world in a day of ecumenical interest in Christian theology issuing from all cultures and linguistic heritages. The work of a translator is often as important as that of a pioneer theologian.

It is unfortunate that the price of the book is so high!

Book Reviews

The Faith We Declare. By EDWIN LEWIS. The Fondren Lectures for 1939. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

PROFESSOR LEWIS has greatly clarified and strengthened his theology, and that of the whole Neo-Orthodox group to which he belongs, in this his latest book. His *Christian Manifesto* was a heartening blast of defiant faith; but it confused many by what appeared to be its negative implications. Did Professor Lewis mean to join the European "revolt against reason"? Was he proposing to return, uncritically and dogmatically, to a "simple gospel" phrased in archaic language quite unrelated to the great social issues and intellectual thought-currents of our time?

In *The Faith We Declare*, these ambiguities in Professor Lewis's new orthodox position are pretty definitely resolved. He is not a Barthian. He is not an anti-intellectualist. He is not an opponent of the social gospel. He means simply to insist that the center of Christian teaching should be found in God's self-revelation in Christ rather than in any sort of human philosophy. If Protestantism had as good a guaranty of continuity with the New Testament and the testimony of the Church as Catholicism possesses in its unchanging liturgy, Professor Lewis would feel that the main task of Protestant theology was that same sort of "peripheral adjustment" of Church dogma to contemporary thought and life which Neo-Thomism so ably attempts. But since Protestantism is mainly dependent upon oral testimony to maintain its continuity, it wavers disastrously when its teachers and preachers listen to alien voices instead of first answering the question, "What think ye of

Christ?" When it thus wavers in its central allegiance, it loses power to speak convincingly to its own time. "We dare not be blind to the Christian significance of the time in which we live," says Professor Lewis (p. 173), "but how can we see that Christian significance if we throw away our Christian eyes? How can we submit our world to a Christian measurement if we throw away our Christian standard?"

Once theology adheres unmistakably to its proper center in Christ, it becomes its privilege and duty to relate the truth as it is in Christ to every order of truth and every sort of practical issue. This is the point which one missed in the *Christian Manifesto*, but it is now made transparently clear. Contemporaneity, says Doctor Lewis, must be "integrated with Christianity in such a fashion as to do justice to both" (p. 175). And in the ethical sphere, the Christian faith is to be declared not only as "the power of a new life," but as "the power of a new social order" and of "a new world politic" as well (p. 207). In all these spheres, Professor Lewis now declares his faith with the boldness of his former book, but with a new reasonableness and a new persuasiveness.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON.

Oberlin College,
Oberlin, Ohio.

The Growth of Lincoln's Faith.
By HARLAN HOYT HORNER. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

FOR all of thirty years I have been reading books about Abraham Lincoln—books new and old. And I have been particularly interested in books that discuss

Mr. Lincoln's religious faith. Most biographers of the Uncommon Commoner present what they believe to be his religious views; but they do not always do so intelligently. Some authors go out of their way to make Mr. Lincoln an infidel. Others repeat the process to prove him an orthodox Christian. Both types of biographers fall short of the goal, because neither position is true to the facts.

Mr. Lincoln was not an "infidel," nor was he "a regular" Christian. Rather he was one who grew in a religious faith, that began humbly, passed through many vicissitudes, and flowered during his presidency in a life of prayer and a trust that was sublime. But he never united with a church, nor was he "theologically-minded." Creedal Christianity troubled him, and hair-splitting definitions of doctrinal niceties failed to impress him.

Professor Harlan Hoyt Horner's *The Growth of Lincoln's Faith* is true to the facts, presenting a series of selections from Mr. Lincoln's own writings that show his expanding faith. The work is convincingly and beautifully done. The chapters, only five in number, trace accurately "One Man's Faith," namely: 1. The Wonder of the Child. 2. The Hunger of the Youth. 3. The Doubt of the Man. 4. The Conviction of the Lawyer and Politician. 5. The Sublime Faith of the President.

This scholarly work ought to set at rest for all time the controversy about Lincoln's religion. That it will succeed in this is too much to expect, for the line of Special Pleaders never runs out. But to readers who are fair-minded and base their conclusions on facts, this volume by Professor Horner will prove conclusive. I hope it may have the wide circulation it so richly deserves.

EDGAR DEWITT JONES.
Central Woodward Christian Church,
Detroit, Mich.

You Americans. Edited by B. P. ADAMS.
New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
\$2.50.

FIFTEEN correspondents of foreign newspapers depict their impressions and estimates of America. They come from Chile, France, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Holland, Mexico, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, China, Japan, Hungary, England and Norway.

These correspondents complain of our lack of knowledge of their country, and do not always demonstrate that their knowledge of America justifies their right to such criticism. The Japanese writer holds that despite occasional waves of hysteria, the average American is friendlier toward the Japanese than he has been for years.

The Chinese correspondent declares that the four great classes of Americans who have transplanted their country's culture miraculously to the other side of the Pacific, are the marines, missionaries, merchants and movie actors. The Chilean computes the United States to be more powerful industrially than Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy combined. The Argentinian asserts a leadership in the Latin-American viewpoint as contrasted with the Anglo-Saxon point of view, and looks forward to the time when Argentina will be the most powerful nation on the American continent. To the Italian writer, Geneva is the political status quo established at Versailles in 1919. He cannot see how the United States can retain its old superiority in living standards with the passing of its advantages in the way of undeveloped resources and mass immigration and with the increasing industrial efficiency of other nations, so that another twenty years may see the vaunted American standard of living reduced to that of the masses of Europe. He maintains that Ethiopia's conquest was forced upon Italy by the cutting off of the tide of immigration by the U. S. A.

The book could have been made to climax more forcefully, yet it is one of the most interesting and informing of recent volumes. The editor, who is the son of a Methodist clergyman, and for years the editor of the *Literary Digest*, has had wide travel opportunities and is gifted with superior powers of picturesque expression.

JOHN W. LANGDALE.

Book Editor of
The Methodist Church.

The Troubled Mind. By HARRY ROBERTS. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. \$2.00.

IN *The Troubled Mind* Harry Roberts, M.D., presents in a popular way his views on the nature of mind and the causes of mental "troubles." Health, for Doctor Roberts, is "essential harmony between the functions of the body but also between the inclinations, urges, and aspirations of the mind and between these and external circumstances." In other words, "Health is a perfect physical, personal, and environmental adjustment."

"Mind" is defined in one place as feeling, thinking, and willing. The "intellect" is "a technical assistant whose function is to guide, to sublimate, but not to replace the inner prompting and vital aspirations." A properly integrated "character" has "a fairly well-defined scale of personal values by which decision is simplified." The "mind" has "primal urges" which are listed as "self-preservation, sex impulse, herd instincts, tender impulse, and curiosity."

Nearly all of our "mental trouble" originates in "the starvation, stultification, or perverse sublimation of one or the other of these inborn psychologic urges." Because of the "artificial" modification of our environment unattended by parallel changes in our "inherent impulses" we have the problem of the "troubled mind."

In this basic thesis Doctor Roberts works out the relation of body and mind, the place of the emotions, and the conflicts in the "mind."

With less stress on "urges" it is rather strange that the author pays so little attention to the unconscious part of the mind, except to note a "curious" process called projection. Naturally he accepts the fundamental theories of Freud, but severely limits the value of psychoanalysis, objects that Freud studied and stressed the pathological and severely denounces the disciples of Freud who are "still muttering" the rejected convictions of their master.

The latter part of the volume consists of chapters by Margaret Nelson Jackson, giving a rather sketchy summary of "insanities" among us called mental diseases, and their treatment, with a chapter on commitments which is exclusively English.

The volume may be summarized as the knowledge gained through experience by a physician who is not a specialist, but whose observations may serve as a popular introduction to the nature of the human mind.

R. D. HOLLINGTON.
Garrett Biblical Institute.

The Congregationalists (1783-1850): Religion on the American Frontier. Vol. III. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. \$3.00.

THIS book is primarily for the student of the origins and development of the Middle West and for those interested in the place of religion in primitive settlements. An infinite amount of research has gone into its preparation, and the material has been selected and arranged with scholarly care.

The bibliography—a cause for rejoicing—in addition to listing the books, pamphlets, and historical documents gives also

their location and a brief estimate of their contents and value.

In the extensive index are listed the names of many pioneers. Most of these were simple folk, and although their lives have been built into the fabric of our country, their names have been unknown except to a few. It is gratifying that they have now found recognition in this excellent history.

More than three fourths of the book is made up of historical documents, each telling its story of heroic endeavor. There are good accounts of the sending of missionaries from the East to the West—then a West without roads—of the founding of churches and schools, and of the vicissitudes of the early missionaries.

Historians will find here a well-told story of the old "Plan of Union." This "Plan," loyally supported by the Congregational churches through the American Home Missionary Society, was founded upon the fiction that "Congregational salt lost its savour" when taken across the Hudson. There was a general feeling that the Presbyterian form of government, providing a measure of oversight for both ministers and churches, was better adapted to frontier conditions than Congregationalism. Thus it came about that Congregational missionary funds and men were used to plant and nourish Presbyterian churches. By means of this "Plan," which worked well for fifty years, the rivalries and antagonisms which naturally arise during the settlement of a new country were in a measure avoided.

Many priceless sentences are to be found embedded in the early records. One missionary superintendent, for instance, in writing about a new recruit sent by the society, said, "He is a sort of a tolerable, pretty fair kind of moderate, good New England minister. All well enough, only not quite the thing for the West. Do what you please. We can set him to work,

but should rather have a man with more 'go off' to him."

There is an interesting comment on the early influence of Oberlin College, with its policy of admitting women on an equal footing with men, and Negroes on an equal footing with whites, and above all with its teaching and practice of "Perfectionism." As a result of these "radical" tendencies, Oberlin was looked at askance by both Presbyterian and Congregational churches and pastors, and some even went so far as to question the validity of baptism administered by an Oberlinite.

In this book pastors will find valuable records and illustrative material. Both pastors and laity will find in it much to stir the emotions and throw light upon the progress of religion and civilization.

FREDERICK L. FAGLEY.

The General Council of the
Congregational and Christian Churches.

The Study of the New Testament.

By CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$1.00.

IF a professional Bible student can fairly judge a book intended for readers who come to it with little previous knowledge of the subject, Professor Craig has admirably met the need for a brief and elementary but up-to-date and reliable account of the origins of the New Testament. The style is clear and readable. The tone is positive, constructive, and liberal.

The introductory chapter, after pointing out the weaknesses of the dogmatic, devotional, and literary approaches, establishes the proper approach to the study of the New Testament as a combination of the historical and the religious. All this is very condensed and bristles with questions for discussion, perhaps also with thorny points which really require more explanation. The suggestion of the pref-

ace that the introduction may be discussed in connection with the concluding chapter rather than at the beginning deserves serious consideration.

One of the great merits of the book is its clear presentation of the positive results of recent research, all co-ordinated and given their due place in relation to the more familiar facts. Perhaps the best example of this is the chapter on "The Gospel Before the Gospels," a remarkably successful summary of the main results of form-criticism, so far as these results are acceptable to sober, moderate scholarship.

With regard to critical questions in general, the author's position is fairly representative of the general consensus of New Testament scholarship at present. On disputed points the alternatives are impartially stated, sometimes without any clear expression of preference. Occasionally one feels that the author comes perilously near to assuming that the majority of scholars must be right, but that impression is probably due to the fact, repeatedly noted, that the limits of the book and its purpose preclude discussion of critical views on their merits. Certainly in such cases the clear recognition of difficulties and of various possibilities is greatly to be preferred to arbitrary choice and dogmatic statement of one alternative as though it were well-established fact.

Readers of this book will at least realize that all the questions have not been answered in Biblical studies, and that is all to the good.

The final chapter presents the New Testament as a whole as the record of the faith of the early Church, and the book closes with a plea, restrained and reasonable, for the primacy of the Bible in Christian education. Thus ends what may be heartily commended as an excellent introductory sketch of New Testament origins.

It would be hard indeed to imagine how the task could have been done much better.

MILLAR BURROWS.

Yale University.

The Study of Theology. Edited by KENNETH ESCOTT KIRK. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$3.75.

THIS is not a *Summa Theologiae* but is intended rather for educated lay people. The editor hopes that, perchance, theological students and ministers may here find matters of concern and that "even professed scholars" may not be without interest.

Lay intelligence and interest are likely of higher grade in England than on this side of the water! True, this is a useful book to hand (with discrimination) to an occasional layman in America, but it has greater value, we would judge, as an introduction for Seminary students—a well-balanced propaedeutic.

Even more worth may well attach to this comprehensive creation when used by parish ministers for purposes of self-re-education, and (possible) reorientation. Each half decade demands such self-discipline on the part of every "able minister of the New Testament." Books in special fields are often available for this purpose; such as Professor Scott's many books on New Testament subjects (books little only in physical dimension)—but authentic surveys of the whole field are not often found. Professor G. B. Smith of Chicago assembled such a comprehensive volume nearly twenty-five years ago. It was and is superlative. He called it, modestly, *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion*. The introductory articles in Professor Peake's One Volume Commentary have served a similar purpose to this reviewer—and a host of others.

Bishop Kirk's *Study of Theology* will take a place less commanding than these two, I judge, but a worthy and useful

place on the same shelf, and will often be found in the questing hands of such ministers as neither principalities nor powers can deter from their first avowed intent to be informed.

Scholarly, needless to say; edited by Kenneth E. Kirk, and with a great array of contributors, mostly from Oxford. Nonconformists are here in creditable proportion with Churchmen. But it is a new generation. This reviewer, and men of his time, when they see (or say) "Regius in Hebrew," think "Driver," or "Lady Margaret in Divinity," . . . "That's Sunday." Now, it's Danby and it's Williams—new names to us who are out on the periphery of contemporary scholarship.

Micklem of Mansfield is here and Dodd, the one recipient of a divinity degree at the Harvard tercentenary; a non-conformist, he holds the divinity chair at Cambridge (something rather new in Israel).

Comprehensive—witness chapters on comparative religion; the philosophy of religion; its psychology; the Old Testament and the New—fine balance here at the hands of Professor Dodd—no *Formgeschichte* stampede. Symbolics and history of doctrine; church history in suggestive outline, moral theology (by the editor) and liturgics. Inclusive—that's the better word.

We have read once, with profit and appreciation; we shall read again to "mark," and yet again to "inwardly digest"—it is that kind of a book. It is overpriced (for a preacher's pocketbook), but cannot be easily overevaluated. If there are major faults in its scholarly opinions they are not visible to this lay-ministerial-non-scholarly-eye. It is a book to own and use as a backlog to the fire that burns to warm the mind. (It will radiate to those who come to hear at sermon time.)

JESSE HALSEY.

The Seventh Presbyterian Church,
East Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Negro's God, As Reflected in His Literature. By BENJAMIN E. MAYS. Boston: Chapman and Grimes, Inc. \$2.00.

IN view of the tremendous hearing given the play "Green Pastures," it is a timely and happy coincidence that we should have at this time a scientific study of the Negro's religious attitudes, written by so competent a scholar as Dean Mays, of the School of Religion of Howard University. A Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Chicago, with his major studies in the field of theology, and the head of the Department of Theology in his own institution, Dean Mays is probably the best-equipped man of the Negro group to make this particular contribution.

In his preface Dean Mays states that the "aim of the author is to tell America what the Negro thinks of God." The general plan of the book is to trace the development of the idea of God in Negro literature from 1760 to 1937. He classifies this literature as "mass" and "classical." The "mass" literature represents the ideas of God taught the average Negro churchgoer and is to be found in the spirituals, sermons, prayers and Sunday-school literature. The "classical" literature comprises slave narratives, biography, addresses, novels, poetry and the writings of social scientists. The investigation is divided into three epochs, as far as the time-span is concerned: 1760 to the close of the Civil War; the Civil War to 1914; the beginning of the World War to the present.

Dean Mays finds that the ideas of God in Negro literature are developed along three principal lines, what he designates as traditional or compensatory patterns—"God fights the battles of His chosen people, and He will bring them out victors in every crisis," "All things work together for those who love the Lord," "What they lack in this life will be made up in heaven," and so forth.

While Dean Mays rates the spirituals "as one of the greatest contributions to American culture," he nevertheless believes the ideas of God they portray "are conducive to developing in the Negro a complacent laissez faire attitude toward life."

There will doubtless be those, like this writer, who cannot accept this view of the effect of the Negro spirituals on their slave-creators. If, as Dean Mays asserts, "They represent the soul-life of the people . . . and through them the race was able to endure suffering and survive," the ideas they contain cannot be treated lightly. Is it not more correct to say that the Negro spirituals represent one of the finest illustrations of the possibilities of religion in the life of a racial group that we have in modern times? The only body of extant literature that is comparable to them is the Hebrew Psalms, and many of them fall below the level of the spirituals, in that they display vindictiveness and the spirit of retaliation. Instead of being a source of weakness, the otherworld emphasis in the spirituals represents the greatest spiritual achievement of the slave, namely, the discovery of God and a conviction of His adequacy for the needs of mankind, however desperate the situation. This has been the chief function of religion, at its best, in every age.

Dean Mays notes that in the spirituals there is to be found the social emphasis, and while there is no large increase of it even in the later epochs, as far as the "mass" literature is concerned, there is an increasing emphasis on social and economic improvement in the "classical" literature. One of the most interesting sections of the book is that dealing with the atheistic tendencies of a growing number of the Negro intelligentsia. These writers, Dean Mays believes, are not merely speaking for themselves, but for an increasing number of Negroes who, finding themselves hampered and restricted in the

social situation, have lost faith in the traditional patterns of religion.

Despite what seems to us a lack of appreciation of the value of the spirituals for religion, Dean Mays has rendered a very valuable and timely service in his illuminating book, *The Negro's God*. One of its greatest values will be found in its revelation of the thinking of an increasing number of the Negro intelligentsia. It is to be hoped that Protestant Christianity in America may sense the possibilities for weal or woe in this situation and seek to make more real, in the social and economic realms, the Christianity we profess.

WILLIS J. KING.

Gammon Theological Seminary.

Free Men. Forest Essays—Third Series.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$2.00.

UNDER this broad title Doctor Hough discusses a variety of themes. Here are essays which will stand with Benson and Brierly and more formal addresses presented to distinguished assemblies. The justification for all appearing in this volume of Forest Essays is that the various utterances face problems upon which the world awaits leadership in a time of general intellectual confusion.

The variety in approach makes it possible to draw upon all the disciplines for facts, arguments and appeals.

The scientist will not find here exhaustive discussions of a special field nor will the philosopher be conscious of new deductions. The theologian may not find his particular problems solved nor will the prophet feel that the last word of insight has been uttered; but all will be conscious of rare appreciation of the ranges of fine culture. He who reads this volume will be instructed, learn of the achievements of scholarship and be lifted to new spiritual insights and experiences.

The first page stirs deep into the thought

world, "Of all the amazing spectacles which the world affords, the most astonishing of all, if we could really see it, is just the sight of free men in the act of choice." You will not exhaust that in an hour. When you have read what the author has to say you will be ready to agree with him in the statement, "For the moment you really begin to think and move toward recreation of a philosophic system, you will find it necessary to use enough freedom to destroy any system of determinism." "The philosopher who uses his free mind in order to construct a process of reasoning by means of which to deny the existence of freedom is really the funniest man in all the world."

The minister who finds himself wondering how the Church can meet the problems of the world in this confused day will find a challenge in "The Price of Christian Literacy."

Perhaps there is no finer chapter than "The Church and the Society of Men's Minds." Here one finds a delightfully phrased protest against economic determinism and a plea for the recognition of man's spiritual quality.

One is amazed at the author's erudition as he reads "Through the Eyes of Radhakrishnan." The study of this chapter is fine mental discipline and at the same time suggests the answer to those who are enamored by the pleasant-sounding phrases of the popular Swamis who attract superficial searchers for the mystical as a substitute for a religion based on a system of ethics and intellectual integrity.

"Making Theology Available for Religion," a Princeton Theological Seminary address, is one of the most practical utterances in the volume. In these days when certain types seek to relegate theology to the scrap heap of the outmoded it is refreshing to have so brilliant a mind make increasingly clear the dependence of permanent religious propaganda upon an intelligent theological foundation. In his

final chapter Doctor Hough lifts Aldersgate out of the commonplace interpretation which makes it a mere historical event, as he makes clear its fundamentally important message for intelligent Christianity for all time. "What the world waited for was not new light on responsibility, but new spiritual power." In his emphasis upon the necessity of spiritual struggle and the exercise of deliberate choice in the building of character Doctor Hough seems to understate the effect of environment. After all, if we ever have good men we must give them the help of a good society.

LUTHER FREEMAN.

Pomona, California.

The Quest for Religious Certainty.

By HAROLD A. BOSLEY. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$2.50.

DOCTOR BOSLEY has summarized with clarity and brevity the chief ventures in the search for truth; philosophy emphasizing coherence with a set of first principles; theology insisting upon coherence with revelation; science demanding coherence with "things"; high religion surrendering everything except the "area of possible achievement"; the Barthian "resolve your doubts by believing," "when you wholly believe in it you will know that it is true"; the new supernaturalism with its dependence upon "the music of meaning not of parts but of the totality"; and finally the only certainty in which the author believes, "the certainty that is vouchsafed him who believes both in the reality of specific values and in the possibility of a fuller relationship with them."

The author builds upon what he calls "the functional philosophy of value." Value is described as an "experience of enjoyment born of satisfied desires." The enjoyments which open the door to further enjoyments are the real values, "the

blessing of the Lord which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow thereto." But the enjoyment is not merely subjective. It is "dependent in part upon objective factors to which human desires may be adjusted but which are not plastic in any other sense." He finds not merely values in the universe but value-structure. Values do not exist in isolation. They are passionate in their search for each other. That value-structure whereby values exist for each other and are complete in each other is what he means by God. Said in other words, "God is the permanent possibility of greater value." The reader who is familiar with Wieman's identification of God with growth of meaning will detect at once a warm philosophic kinship beneath slightly different phraseology.

Sinfulness is defined as inconstant loyalty to supreme value, insubordinate loyalties or refusal to recognize and abide by the implications for life of the organic structure of value. Salvation, therefore, must mean deliverance from such disloyalties to supreme value. It begins when a man sincerely seeks that supreme value in every choice and is furthered by a realization that he is being aided in his search by that dynamic nature of value which has been described as the love of God.

The functional philosophy of value dismisses with a gesture the "battle-scarred doctrines that deal with the physical, psychological, and volitional nature of Jesus." It affirms not His uniqueness but His supremacy. "Nowhere else in the universe has the value-structure which is God risen in such compelling grandeur as in Jesus' life." "His life and teachings therefore are the clearest revelation we have."

A stimulating final chapter holds in wise polarity tentativeness and certainty in ethical conduct. There is vigorous affirmation of (1) the relevance of ideals to moral problems; (2) the possibility of

discovering the fuller nature of God through ethical action; (3) commitment to God as the enduring incentive to ethical action.

The supernaturalist will agree neither with Doctor Bosley's premises nor many of his conclusions, but he will find here an honest, intelligent survey of the problems involved in the quest for God and a brave and moving endeavor to offer the beginnings of an empirical philosophy of religion based upon the experience of value. He will be impressed with the moral passion everywhere in evidence and the creative faith which claims as its inspiration and authority the method of observation and reason. I do not believe it is necessary to surrender the uniqueness of Jesus as the author has done. There is something to be said for the Kierkegaard-Barthian insistence upon the "qualitative difference between time and eternity." If "a little less and something seems to lack; a little more and, oh, what worlds away," when the little less becomes the vastly less of humanity and the little more the vastly more of deity what worlds away indeed! God is unique, and the Jesus who is to be the revelation of God will have to be, not merely "supreme" but unique! Nor can I abandon revelation as a source of truth. The history of those insights which have opened up new chapters in the moral and religious history of the race is most explicable when regarded as the fresh disclosure of the Light that follows all our way. To be sure, those insights must be tested by reason and experience. But when they are made hypotheses for action and yield fruitful results in abundant living, we are justified in calling them revelations, gifts of God to human need. We should never have found them of ourselves. But once they are given, we do find them to be life and health and peace. I do not care to enter a theological disputation with a man who affirms as the

author does: "Men who believe that when they see Jesus they see God, and who live by this belief are saved. . . . He who dwells in Christ and in whom Christ dwells is saved by God in Christ."

This book is evidently only the report of the initial stages of an intellectual and moral and spiritual pilgrimage which began with dreams of a better city and is determined not to "account the pang nor grudge the throe" until the shining towers and gleaming spires come into view. There will be many who will await with eagerness further chronicles from this sturdy traveler, and who will join the reviewer in the prediction that this keen mind and glowing heart are headed toward a ministry of great significance to the uncertain multitudes who wander betwixt two worlds, "one dead, the other powerless to be born."

ALBERT EDWARD DAY.

First Methodist Church,
Pasadena, Cal.

God of the Living. By R. H. L. SLATER.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
\$2.50.

The Evangel of a New World. By
ALBERT EDWARD DAY. Nashville:
The Cokesbury Press. \$1.50.

BOTH of these books sound a strong note of hope. Thinking further of similarity, there is the same affirmation of the ultimate as you find it in the divine. Both authors bring to a reader the vision of the eternal breaking in upon the present with authority over our mundane affairs. "When they (Christians) vote," says Doctor Day, "they will not vote as Republicans or Democrats or Socialists, but as sons of the Kingdom." Doctor Slater sees this eternal authority functioning in a sense of vocation. Quite wrong has been "the view which expects the clergyman to decide whether he will accept a bishopric by reference to the divine will, but leaves the

haberdasher to decide whether he will open a new store merely by reference to his personal greed or ambition."

God of the Living is a book full of the good solid stuff of the mind; nor has the reasoning of the heart been omitted. It has a homely nature. The author frequently steps aside to ruminate or to clarify and then, with "a moment ago I was saying" manner, resumes his thought. The general ground of the book is to be found in the Spencerian idea of the relation of the future goal to present existence. Under the mind of the author this ground yields some very hearty and nourishing fruit, some of which may be stated briefly as follows: faith is power in every area of life including science; spirituality has an ultimacy of its own; believe in God not because the problem of evil has been intellectualized into harmlessness, but because He is God; let us have no entangling alliances with philosophies old or new, for Christianity can create its own philosophy.

Doctor Slater discerns a "mood" which has captured our present time in which the vitalism of life is all important. This "high wind" has influenced everything from sculpture to theology. Anything can happen—even the miraculous. But this view that life is mainly activity leads us to the problem of change, a view which seems to reveal life as "a chameleon rampant against a Joseph's coat of many colors." But what may seem to be superficial change is part and parcel of a changing reality. To the author the water is stirred at its depths, not just rippled. With this in mind the discussion journeys to the nature of process and progress. Immortal life is not changeless. Full communion with the living God means progress anywhere. That we "shall be the Church at rest" does not excite us. The adventure continues in heaven. Nor is God changeless. The eternal is affected by the now. Experience with us affects Him. Our belief is not in an Absolute, but in a Being

who lives with us through change. Divine love cannot be static.

In this interesting pattern of change personality is to be seen, ever evolving to higher form. The highest development finds man sensible to wide relations, sensible, too, to an inner center of being. Up through this center rises an inspiring influence that harmonizes, coheres and fulfills. Christ is working here as the love of God.

With it all there is a crescendo about this book. Its pages are permeated with a hope that breathes and lives.

Albert Day's book performs the useful service of helping us to stand up to our badly worn out Utopian efforts. "For that despair a Christian evangel has a burning word of hope." Doctor Day indicates that his own thinking has changed somewhat in respect to the accomplishment of a just human kingdom. His experience, as he relates it, does not reveal discouragement so much as reorientation to the problem of building a better world. His feeling of hope rises out of the possibility of starting anew by seeing what Jesus really meant the Kingdom to be. He concludes that the Kingdom is to come by God's power and through the work of Christ. It has been too much a work of our own. Considerable room is given to the supernatural view. "God beyond the process is ever breaking into the process, lifting it to higher levels." We will rise not by the development of human excellence merely, but by "the irruption of what has been the divine scene."

But the evangel is also one of judgment. Every realm of thinking and doing must be open to the spirit of divine scrutiny. We are under the personal compulsion of attempting to be Godlike at every point. The author posits as a standard of judgment "access to the kingdom of God." If this is to hold water we must carry it as a standard with real enthusiasm to our social situation. At a time when America

seems to be, commissioned to demonstrate in Democracy the fact that justice and liberty are real, it would be a regrettable thing to shift from the social gospel to any position which would involve us in less concern for the injustice and social suffering of mankind. "A poverty that denies bread is a poverty that defies the kingdom of God, makes impossible its access to the hearts of men."

Again, we are to preach a message of love; it rests on the bedrock of rationality. God is in this world and has not let go of us. The Cross witnesses to that.

The book carries a very strong plea for understandable preaching. "Much that is said in the pulpit has no sky." Also let our preaching be Christ-centered.

In spots there is just a little too much of a Chestertonian play on words. This book, however, is destined for a career of wide usefulness. It informs and codifies and gives heart for the work of the gospel.

HAZEN WERNER.

Grace Methodist Church,
Dayton, Ohio.

Preaching the Gospel. By HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$1.50.

The Fine Art of Public Worship. By ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

THE primary task of the Church is to bear witness to the gospel of Christ. Preaching is the most important function of the minister. Doctor Robbins, in the John Bohlen Lectures for 1938, has written a little book that should be in the hands of every minister in the country. He is right when he says: "Ages which are marked by a decline in preaching of the gospel are always ages of degeneration and decay."

One of the very practical problems of the minister is how to plan his preaching program. The Committee on Worship

of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has given expression to a deep and widespread conviction that one of the best methods for the planning of a minister's preaching program is the use of the Christian Year. This Committee has published a calendar based upon the historic tradition of the Church and yet adapted to the necessities of the non-liturgic churches.

The Christian Year is no accident nor is it a mere ecclesiastical process. It is rooted deep in the needs of the soul, in the experiences of men. The observance of any ritual year is not a forced or artificial thing. All great cultures or civilizations have expressed themselves in festivals and celebrations. Out of its long history the people of Israel built their church year of fast and festival. The Christian Year is a constant reminder of the historic reality of the life of Christ.

We cannot escape history, and when the pressure of the contemporary is so heavy upon us it is a good and great thing to have days of remembrance when we recall all the gracious wonder of God's disclosure of Himself in the Bethlehem Babe who grew to be the Man of Galilee and the Lord of all Good Life. There is no better way to use the seasons of the year than as seasons of the soul, following the events and festivals of the Christian Year.

The task of the Church is to make every year Christian. There must be new realizations of spiritual power and moral conquest. "In common with other forms of human experience, religious experience is subject to the influence of rhythm. It has its ebb and flow; it has also its successions like those of the seasons, its pulsations like the systole and diastole of the human heart. A wise preacher will take note of this law and use it to homiletical advantage." (Page 19.)

The calendar of the Christian Year is helpful and good to live and work by. An old English ballad sings:

"O live ye by the Calendar,
And with the good ye dwell;
The Spirit that comes down on them
Shall lighten you as well."

I do not know of a book on preaching written in recent years that is more practically valuable to a working minister than this scholarly and spiritually significant book of Doctor Robbins.

In *The Fine Art of Public Worship*, Doctor Blackwood deals in a very practical fashion and with a living sense of historic background with one of the most important phases of the Church today. In every communion there is a new evaluation of the place of worship. If there is to be a revival of religion there must be first a revival of public worship.

Public worship is a corporate or collective consent to the living God. Matthew Arnold was voicing the experience of the race when he said that, while man philosophizes best alone, he worships best in common. There are two reasons for this. The movement of a group always lifts the individual into a richer and more intense experience than would be his in isolation. The second reason why man worships best in common is more fundamental. A God who is love finds us readiest for His incoming when we are consciously sharing each other's aspirations. God fulfills His purpose not through separated individuals but through a fellowship of those who are gripped by His purpose.

It is not without significance that Doctor Blackwood has titled his book *The Fine Art of Public Worship*. He knows the value of artistic forms and that "public worship is for the glory of God and the blessing of His people, not for the sake of affording the minister a livelihood." Here is a setting forth of the values of historic liturgy and the freer forms of worship. He commends an optional liturgy to be used without any sense of ecclesiastical compulsion, but rather because of

the free movement of the spirit. He senses the need of a more vital worship that will actually bring God into the experience of men. "The Public Reading of the Scriptures" and the suggestive Lectionary is not the least valuable chapter in the book. The two chapters dealing with "The Meaning of Public Prayers" and "The Fine Art of Leading in Prayer" need the careful attention of most ministers. Bishop McDowell used to say that the thing most poorly done by most ministers was the pastoral prayer. In a service of worship the failure is often not the sermon, but in the dead or deadening prayers. As Dr. John Henry Jowett once said: "There is nothing more dreadfully unimpressive than extemporary prayer which leaps about on the surface of things, a disorderly dance of empty words, going we know not whither, a mob of words carrying no blood, bearing no secret of the soul, a whirl of insignificant expressions, behind which is no vital pulse, no silent cry from lone and desolate depths."

Out of a rich pastoral experience Doctor Blackwood speaks with understanding and authority to his fellows in the ministry. For him worship is not a matter of artificiality. It is rather an adventure in art. His spirit is perhaps best expressed in the closing sentence of the book, in a prayer of dedication of a man ordained of God.

"From day to day, let the man ordained of God to lead in public worship dedicate himself anew to his high calling: 'Here am I, O Lord, an earthen vessel. Take me just as I am, cleanse me by thy Holy Spirit, and fill me with thy blessed Word. Then shall I lead in the worship of thy House so that the people will lose sight of me, because every eye will be fixed on the Lord Jesus.'"

"It were to be wished the flaws were fewer,
In the earthen vessel, holding treasure . . .

But the main thing is, does it hold good measure?

Heaven soon sets right all other matters."

OSCAR THOMAS OLSON.

Epworth-Euclid Church,
Cleveland, Ohio.

When Social Work Was Young. By
EDWARD T. DEVINE. New York:
The Macmillan Company. \$1.75.

WHOEVER knows anything about social work knows well the name of Edward T. Devine. In this field his name is, quite definitely, one to conjure with. And those of us who commenced to pay heed to social questions back before the war, will not forget that the man *par excellence* who gave us the introduction to these questions was this man who has just written the story of his life in terms of his chief interest. He calls his autobiography—with characteristic objectivity—*When Social Work Was Young*.

In some respects those were "the good old days"—at least for philanthropy. "The new confidence was in what might be accomplished by conscious social action." It was a confident belief that "even ancient wrongs could be righted; that natural resources could be conserved and exploited for the common good; that the civil service could be reformed and put upon a merit basis by competitive examination and a secure tenure for the competent; that international co-operation for the general good could be indefinitely extended; that education is the ultimate cure for everything that needs to be cured. This was the prevailing faith."

Naturally, with such confidence and in such a faith, those who were actuated by good will and a sense of social responsibility beyond the average, would almost be certain to see what could be done to

accomplish some of the things which seemed so important. Out of this resolve came the remarkable movement of organized charity which marked an epoch in the history of human effort to alleviate and eliminate the chief kinds of suffering among mankind. This was done on an entirely voluntary basis except for the employment of increasingly well-trained experts and specialists in the field. All the funds came from individuals and groups who gave their money for the explicit purpose of relieving sickness, poverty, hardship, and every social ailment which could be traced back to a specific societal cause.

The principles of this movement, besides those of voluntary support and trained professional service, were three: "*Investigate, organize, educate.*" It was, in other words, one of the first great experiments in history looking toward the solving of human problems on a purely scientific basis by highly organized groups gathered under the influence of sheer good will and acting entirely outside the area of politics. Emphasis was consistently placed upon *friendliness* as a *sine qua non* of properly oriented social work: and while efficiency came sometimes to occupy too large a place in the minds of professional social workers, mere efficiency was never encouraged for its own sake but only as being part of the scientific method. "So important was friendly visiting as a feature of the society's work that its very purpose was sometimes described as giving effective scope and direction to volunteer service, the promotion of intelligent friendly visiting as a means of helping the poor out of their difficulties, and establishing or re-establishing normal neighborly relations, in place of degrading dependence on the kind of alms which one gives or receives as a stranger, on superficial impression or solicitation."

Here then were people of capacity, intelligence, scruple and humane sensibilities, bent upon making this world a very

much better place for the great commonality of people to live in. "We were not cynical, disillusioned pessimists, nor yet complacent and illusioned reactionaries. We had a disciplined, realistic faith. We thought that our daily tasks had social significance."

One of the most valuable contributions made by Doctor Devine and the group with whom he was associated, was the setting up, in 1912, of the corporation so well known by the name, *Survey Associates*. Mark well, this was in 1912: in the year which represents what was undoubtedly the peak moment in the development of liberal humanitarian action in modern civilization—and for that matter, in civilization seen as a whole. Since then "the decade of confidence" has almost been forgotten (save by a few whose memories are poignantly clear) in the turmoil and catastrophic confusions of two decades in which fantasy has mingled itself with fear. But even so, *The Survey Graphic*, chief progeny of *Survey Associates, Inc.*, still carries on: and in such a way as to prove how possible it is for faith, if it be stalwart enough and grounded deeply enough in the eternal verities, to maintain itself through years of fantasy and terror very much as a good ship can weather the worst storms. As a matter of fact, *The Survey Graphic* is just as invaluable today as it was when we first began feeding upon it in the year before the first Great War. Only one thing is lacking, and that is the peculiarly pungent, personal quality of Edward Devine's famous "page" which was called "Social Forces."

The social worker of that earlier time and even of today is bound, says Doctor Devine, to be essentially a reformer; and he or she is always looking about for some specific time and place in which to commence a certain reform. "The social worker at his best is an indefatigable crusader for specific reform or reforms, one who combines a knowledge of facts with

a zeal for action; who agitates ceaselessly for the cause, whether others are interested or not; who cheerfully accepts the hostility of any who profit from the evils to be eradicated, but seeks to make friends of all who can be brought to enlist in the righteous cause; who builds his program on the basis of experience—that is to say, the actual experience of the victims of injustice or hardships—rather than on the illusions, the easy generalizations and the prejudices absorbed in casual contacts.”

The answer which one is likely to hear now to such an affirmation, is the dubious, “Yes, but.” For we are not living today in a situation that calls merely for reform. Reform belongs to an era when people generally can be sure that the foundations of their existence are sound and intact. Reform belongs to a time when the best energies of socially responsible men and women may be directed toward improving a situation which is regarded as being essentially well and good.

But reform ceases to be relevant when the foundations themselves seem to be shaking and crumbling. Reform does not belong to a time when the very underlying elements in a situation are seen to be wrong and in need of replacement. What is demanded then instead of reform is what can only be called *redemption*.

Today, the task of the social worker is in certain respects more difficult, profounder perhaps—in the most searching meaning of the term, *religious*. It seemed possible “back there” in the nineties and in the “naughty-naughts” and in the tens and the twenties even, at least to pretend to take it for granted that the religious-moral bases underlying scientific social work could be depended on to hold up the structure of society while the necessary reforms were being carried on. Not so now. And that is why it is quite right to speak of this decade we are now living through as “the decade of fear.”

Even so, however, the spirit of social

work in the days of its youth is still and will always be the same spirit: for it is “the spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of science, the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. It knows no craven fear. It knows only courage. It is not occult. It is common sense.”

The fact that this is not the prevailing spirit of the present time does not in any way or measure deprive it of its meaning or its value to civilization. Another time will come, with little doubt, when not only social work but the whole interest and occupation of civilized humanity will be what Edward Devine and his sanguine associates would doubtless like it to be: namely, the interest and occupation of intelligent people in a humane society seeking to lift the standard of living for all in every area of existence.

DWIGHT J. BRADLEY.

Executive Director of the
Council for Social Action.

Reality. By PAUL WEISS. Princeton: Princeton University Press. \$3.50.

THIS book shows high metaphysical courage and ability. Its title, *Reality*, should not lead anyone to expect in it a discussion of the questions considered in Canon Streeter's well-known book. It is much closer in subject matter and in its compact asceticism of treatment to an important philosophical classic of about a generation ago, namely, F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*. We have before us a solid treatise on the fundamentals of epistemology and metaphysics, by a professor of philosophy (at Bryn Mawr), whose training and thinking in both have been visibly profound. It is a book for philosophers, but, as always is true in philosophy, its implications are important for everybody. Aristotle and Kant, among classical philosophers, and Professors Morris R. Cohen and Alfred North Whitehead, among the living, are

acknowledged as his principal teachers, from whom, as befits a good pupil, he does not hesitate to differ. Their influence is seen in the sweep of the author's enterprise and in his disdain of easy and oversimplified answers to life's questions. Whitehead, perhaps more than anyone else in recent years, has taught young men once more to dream metaphysical dreams. So encouraged, Professor Weiss does not hesitate to ask great metaphysical questions, in fact the greatest of them all: What is the real? along with its intimate correlate: How can we know it?

The problem of knowledge is considered first, and to its penetrating discussion half of the book is devoted. This part is written largely under the inspiration of Charles Saunders Peirce, a "seminal thinker," who is only now, a hundred years after his birth, really coming into his own, in part certainly as a result of the posthumous publication of his collected papers under the co-editorship of Professor Weiss. Peirce's logical acumen, keenness of analysis, and courageous original thinking are present also in this book under review. Throughout there is manifest the desire to discover a philosophy that will do justice to experience and reality in all their richness, depth, and breadth. To this end dogmatic empiricism, realism, rationalism, and idealism are all rejected, not without respect, however, for their excellent partial insights. The temptation of irrationalism, so seductive to many today, including even philosophers and theologians, is also rejected. The real is inseparable from the rational, but the real is not the abstract, which without the concrete is, as Hegel taught, bare nothing. Our knowledge of reality can never be complete, so much there always remains to know. In fact, much is made of ignorance, not in the interest of skepticism, but in the spirit of Socrates, who too held that the awareness

and acknowledgment of ignorance was basic to knowledge. Yet, for all this, the author's confidence in reason remains high. In spite of his readiness to listen to the testimony of experience in its many forms, it is logic which time and again determines for him what the real shall be. The contradictory not only cannot be true; it cannot be real. Little wonder, then, that the ultimate principle or category of knowledge and of reality, so strenuously sought, is declared to be the principle of non-contradiction expressible in the formula: x is-not non- x .

This abstract formula, familiar to all students of logic as a fundamental law of thought, might seem at first barren of interest and novelty, but it must quickly be added that the author's application of it to reality is most unexpected and original. For, notice, the abstract formula asserts the unassimilable individuality of x . Everything, in other words, is what it is (or better, what it is becoming, for this is a philosophy in which time and process are taken very seriously) and not something else. The world, therefore, cannot be a monism, no matter in what guise it may be presented. No, the world is, and always will remain, full of many things. It is for this reason that, while theological questions are only grazed (though many are implied), the ontological argument for the existence of God, in so far as it attempts to establish one single all-sufficient Being, is rejected. Behind every page, no matter how technical it may seem, is this declaration of the independence, relative, to be sure, of the individual.

Some readers may feel that too much is here made of the individual (a radical pluralism has its own difficulties, though it avoids those of monism); but what troubled this reviewer was not the author's insistence upon the irreducible uniqueness of the individual, but his re-

peated characterization of him (or "it," since all reality is under consideration), as consisting in its essence "in a tendency to incorporate within itself whatever other there may be, so that it may become self-complete" (p. 213, cf. also p. 214). The striving after self-completion or perfection of each individual (which makes it necessary for time to endure), gives charm and appeal to this dynamic philosophy, though it is difficult to see how it is derived from the bare principle of non-contradiction; but why must striving after perfection be conceived as an unremitting endeavor on the part of each entity to "possess everything else"? It may be that the language is unfortunate, and it is hard for me to accept it as the author's intention, but we seem to be in the presence of Nietzsche's will-to-power, heightened to the will-to-become-the-Absolute, who (or which) was rejected, it would seem, only to make room for *all* entities to strive to become like it. What Reinhold Niebuhr regards as man's greatest sin, namely, his attempt to become God, is here declared to be, for a reason far from clear, in principle and essence the dynamic character of all reality. Fortunately, the author assures us, this tendency can never really be satisfied, owing, apparently, to the fact that one part of the essence of being, its stubborn irreducibility, seems to contradict the other, its striving to incorporate all others. But is then not a profound metaphysical pessimism, akin to Schopenhauer's, the outcome of this ontology?

Important modifications of this characterization of all entities as engaged in this self-completion by the incorporation of all others are made by the author's recognizing that inorganic beings "cannot assimilate anything" (p. 260), and that organisms, and among them, humans especially, are highly selective and actu-

ally do not strive to incorporate more than what is relevant to their needs at any given time (pp. 213, 245, 247, 252, 258). Universal competitive possessiveness receives its greatest, and rather unexpected modification, however, by the important recognition that man may win "vicarious self-completion" through knowledge, though it seems only a second-best (pp. 284-5). To assimilate others through knowledge would, no doubt, make a vast difference to the assimilated, but why then retain the terms of possession and incorporation? Sympathetic insight into the reality of others, a Bergsonian phrase used by the author in discussing art (p. 116), would seem a possible and much more attractive alternative. In any case, where there are irreducible units of being, they may either be, if indifference is ruled out, in a state of mutual aggressiveness or of co-operation (or both). But the alternative of co-operation in the building of a community is hardly even mentioned, and then only in passing in the final chapter devoted to a brief consideration of ethics. In view of this hint, and the author's earlier assertion that "it is moral action which at once tests, rectifies, and enriches what philosophy we may achieve" (p. 15), a further development of his stimulating philosophy to include ethics, the reviewer allows himself to hope, will no doubt show, instead of the competitive and excluding individualism set forth in this book, an approach to an individualism in which mutual co-operation is stressed. The logical penetration, wide sympathies, and metaphysical massiveness of this book make at least one reader look forward with eager interest to such a further development in the direction of a theory of value and ethical conduct.

CORNELIUS KRUSÉ.

Wesleyan University.

Bookish Brevities

The article by John Foster Dulles—"The Church's Contribution Toward a Warless World"—which appears in this issue, was given as an address before the United Christian Convention, at Bushnell Memorial Hall, Hartford, Connecticut.

"World Christianity: Assumptions and Actuality," the article by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, constitutes a portion of his forthcoming book, *For the Healing of the Nations: Impressions of Christianity Around the World*.

Prentice-Hall, Inc. has brought out a beautifully printed book, *A Digest of the Bible* (\$2.75). It is a condensation of the King James Version into some three hundred pages by Peter V. Ross. Such a work does not permit the inclusion of the accustomed context, and so varying are the individual valuations of different portions of the Scriptures that some are bound to miss some of their favorite selections. The "Digest," however, is about as satisfying as such a book can be and it is not surprising that it has quickly gone into several printings.

In *The Sum of Things* (E. P. Dutton and Company), Sir Francis Younghusband sets forth that the thing most worth while in life is happiness, not power, nor even wisdom, but happiness, the last end as the original begetter of love. Sir Francis reiterates his reflections on a stern upbringing and a dour faith and an imprisoning orthodoxy. He believes there are other beings higher than man and sees so much good in all religions that he recognizes no excellence in Christianity.

He reports a mystic joy that appears to lack tangibility, though it is best evidenced in the Christmas spirit when we aim to attain for ourselves and to share with others loftier forms of enjoyment.

The October number of *The Expository Times*, of Aberdeen, Scotland, was enlarged in celebration of its fiftieth jubilee. This magazine is one of the most indispensable to thoughtful persons of religious faith. It can be depended upon to provide Biblical criticism that is both vital and scholarly. Its critiques of new Christian literature, including those from American presses, are eagerly read. The writer of these lines has been a constant subscriber from the beginning of his ministry. *The Expository Times* would be one of the last he could surrender should circumstances constrain him to economy in his magazines.

Edward Weeks of *The Atlantic Monthly* thinks we bring too little patience and imagination to our reading and that—paradoxically speaking—because our leisure is too busy. Ever since printing was invented, books have had to compete with domestic felicities, but today books are up against films and the radio, hot music and Fords, golf, skiing, and photography. Only a small fraction of our free time is left for reading.

Then we lost our imagination for reading because for eighteen years we have been asked to swallow grimmer and grimmer doses of realism. Realism unquestionably imparted fresh strength to American writing. But it went to extremes, and in time packed so much vio-

lence, misery, and brutality into print that it soured our minds.

At the 1939 meeting of the American Booksellers' Association Thomas Mann said: "Modern life has brought with it competitors of the book, which are in a better position to pander to the ease as well as the sensational needs of the masses. In contrast with the means of diversion, instruction and propaganda, the book has been shoved back somewhat into the rôle of a cultural-conservative product. Nevertheless, it is the oldest relative of these modern means, and it has not been proved that they are out to take its life. The radio has done much for music, and is thoroughly prepared to do something for the book. I do not find either that the joy of reading suffers from the susceptibility with which one meets the stimuli of the film. The suppression of the book by the inventions and sensations is not likely. Its economic position is dependent on general economic conditions. We need not stand in the sign of skeptical concern about the fate and future of the book—its mission remains, in the midst of all changes, as it was before."

One of the very interesting personalities of the present-day ministry is Dr. Frederick John Foakes Jackson, now Professor Emeritus of Union Theological Seminary. He is often referred to as the most erudite of religious scholars. His recent book, *A History of Church History* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 7s. 6d. net), was written to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of his gaining the Lightfoot Scholarship in Ecclesiastical History of the University of Cambridge. Along its pages are happy allusions to the Founder of that Scholarship.

The first chapter, on the Origin and Development of Ecclesiastical History, is a prime example of definitive scholarship. The various chapters are somewhat unrelated except for the historical theme which is their center of interest. The New Testament Canon, Augustine's Philosophy of History, the Venerable Bede, and Gibbon's Decline and Fall are among the outstanding discussions.

The most notable feature of this valuable book is the grace of its writing. The winged touch of the master delivers the reader from any weight of obvious scholarship.

In his famous monthly review of theology which appears in *The British Weekly*, R. Birch Hoyle commends Bishop McConnell's new book, *John Wesley*. "It is a very competent book. It is evident that the author has put a lifetime's study into this work. He himself has been and is a leading advocate of the social gospel.

"Wesley's Toryism, witchcraft-hating, his slowness to make changes, and the fulsome adulation of his followers, are soberly criticized. The educational value of the class-meeting—alas! declining—trained leaders in democracy—witness Joseph Arch.

"Illuminating is 'the price of leadership' which Wesley paid in his energetic campaigns. Step by step, not according to any premeditated plan, were his departures from Anglican customs, forced upon him by the divine will. Very suggestive are Bishop McConnell's insights into the distinction between a 'Society' and a 'Church': the latter Wesley never meant to found. In the immense library gathered round Wesley's name this book takes a foremost place."